LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 10 1939
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

JX1952
.A87

Prelude to Peace

Prelude to Peace

A Realistic View of International Relations

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY

HENRY A. ATKINSON

HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS

NEW YORK AND LONDON

1937

Prelude to Peace
Copyright, 1937, by Harper & Brothers
Printed in the United States of America
First Edition
H–M

All rights in this book are reserved.
No part of the book may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission.
For information address
Harper & Brothers

CONTENTS

Chapter I. THE QUESTION 1

By way of introduction—Why with so many people praying and working for peace do we fail in our purpose? Can religion help? If the Church is blamed for war and urged to work for peace, how can it be accused of meddling if its efforts become effective?

Chapter II. LET'S BE REALISTIC 11

Meaning and value of this universal appeal—Clash between the dreamer of dreams and doer of deeds—Peace established only as minds and wills of nations changed—A realistic program for an idealistic task.

Chapter III. REALISTIC PREPAREDNESS 22

In times of peace prepare for war—Why not prepare for peace? War proves failure of whole system—Burdens imposed upon mankind by military and naval men—Are citizens masters or servants of the army and navy? Let's be realistic about this question of our own security and defense.

Chapter IV. REALISTIC DISARMAMENT 32

Armaments constitute the greatest single menace to world peace—Arms will not be destroyed until the world is organized for peace and collective security is guaranteed for all—There can be no security and little effective organization until the nations disarm

—How can this vicious circle be broken? This is the heart of the peace problem.

Chapter V. THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE 49

A chapter of history—The League promised disarmament—Story of attempt of the nations to fulfill this promise—Important, if not thrilling but necessary to understand, if we would be realistic.

Chapter VI. BUILDING THE WORLD COMMUNITY 64

Men have learned to live together in city, town and village—Enlightened self-interest—The higher selfishness—The nations still live in anarchy—National frontiers—The gateways to barbarism—The League of Nations—What's wrong with the League?—Suggested changes and proposed methods of making it more effective.

Chapter VII. REALISTIC SANCTIONS 84

Force necessary adjunct of community life—Rarely used but sanctioned—Sanctions in world community—What are international sanctions?—Outlaw and desperado nations—Contrast with individuals—Why sanctions failed against Japan and Italy—National armaments—International police force—Prevention rather than punishment—World public opinion.

Chapter VIII. ACCESS TO RAW MATERIALS 107

Plenty for all—Why some nations have more and others less—Justice demands greater equity in distribution—Who owns the earth?—The Colonial system—National needs and national vanity—War demands—Imperialism and arms—A solution—Conference and agreement.

Chapter IX. NATIONALISM 126

Philosophy and history of State—Why the State?—Master or servant—The State and individual conscience—Ideologies—Nazism—Fascism—Communism—Democracy—Totalitarianism—Coercion—The clash—Patriotism—True and false nationalism—Loyalty and loyalties—To live or to die for the State—Sublimated nationalism.

Chapter X. EDUCATION 143

Education transforms whole generations—Peace or war—The system—Schools—Colleges—Churches—Militarism vs. peace in education—Do we want peace or war?—Let's be realistic and educate for one or the other.

Chapter XI. RELIGION 158

Place of religion in human affairs—Too much speculative goodness—Theology, Metaphysics, Philosophy, all good foundations—Churches overly well-founded—Religion in action—The new apologetic—War and peace the test—"A Peace Committee in every church"—A vital program.

Chapter XII. THE PRICE OF PEACE 181

Final answer to "The Question"—The world can have peace whenever the nations are willing to pay—We all know what it will cost—No debate at this point—Are we willing to pay the price?—Do we really want peace?

APPENDICES 191

BIBLIOGRAPHY 211

Prelude to Peace

CHAPTER ONE

THE QUESTION

HORROR of the past and fears for the future do not prevent men from repeating their old follies and bringing about new destruction upon themselves. In the early years of the nineteenth century Bonaparte was a menace to the peace and happiness of all Europe and a threat to every home and individual. At last he was defeated and the Conference of Vienna met, backed by the hopes of millions of people. The Holy Alliance was created to abolish war and make peace permanent. Then came months of hopefulness, to be followed by a long, dreary period of disillusionment. General Pershing, in speaking in New York City on December 29, 1920, said: "The world does not seem to learn from experience. It would appear that the lessons of the last six years should be enough to convince everybody of the danger of nations striding up and down the earth armed to the teeth." The next war will be more frightful than anything ever known before and will cause unparalleled and widespread destruction through the use of poisonous gases. Whole cities and countrysides will be devastated.

Huge armadas of airplanes have been perfected against which, as Charles Lindbergh said in Berlin, "there is no adequate defense."

Since the end of the war, peace and how to secure it has been the one commanding interest in world affairs. It is doubtful whether there has ever been given more continuous and sincere thought by so many people on any other subject during a like period of eighteen years. Conferences have been held until the very word conference is in bad repute. The nations have been active and have put forward extraordinary efforts to bring about peace in this era. But after all this anxiety and effort the conditions today are more uncertain and there is more fear and distrust of the future even than before those fateful years leading up to 1914. A candid review of the situation is likely to give one a sense of impending gloom. Put your finger down at random on the map of the world, and you are almost certain to touch a spot where there is imminent danger of war, or where its effects are feared. Even the toughest-minded pessimist must feel at least a small gleam of joy as he sees his darkest forebodings being realized.

All major peace efforts seem to have failed. Why? Two things have always conspired to thwart the establishment of universal peace. First, the selfish interests are better organized and more persistent than the forces that work for righteous-

ness. The injunction "be not weary in well-doing" was born out of a long experience with human beings. Some years ago in a municipal election in Chicago the churches and religious people were thoroughly aroused. There was a general uprising of the best citizens. On the day before the election one of the leaders said to a group who met for a final meeting: "Now, we have done all we can. Let us go home and pray that God will give us a good sunshiny day tomorrow, for if it is a good day all the good people will come out and vote; but if it is a stormy day the pious folk will remain home, but even hell and high water can't keep the rascals from voting."

The second reason for the long list of failures is that the idealism of the idealist is seldom put into practice. The eminent Boston physician, Dr. Richard Cabot, speaking of ethics, said: "Most of what used to be called goodness has rightly fallen into disrepute because it is inefficient. As I see it, ethical diagnosis, like physical diagnosis, has a practical end."

Upon the churches and other religious organizations is put the chief responsibility for establishing peace among the nations. The failure is laid upon them, and they are challenged to avert disaster in the future. A number of military men of high rank have expressed their opinion in language that cannot be misunderstood. General Haig said: "The

Gospel of Christ is the world's only social hope, and the sole promise of world peace"; while General Tasker H. Bliss stated: "The Church will be responsible for every drop of blood that is shed in the next war." Major General Smedley D. Butler, in an address at an Armistice Day meeting in Benton Harbor, Michigan, promoted by a group of cooperating local churches, declared: "The Church is the only institution that can lick a war." Major General John F. O'Ryan is not so certain that the churches will do anything about it, nevertheless he feels that they have the responsibility resting upon them. "To many laymen," said he, "religion appears, of late, to have put itself on record as opposed to war, but certainly in relation to action, religion has displayed no such imagination, capacity for organization, cohesiveness of planned action, resolution under fire, and spirit of sacrifice as were displayed daily by the young men of all countries on the battlefields of Europe. And the young men did not fail to observe this failure of religion. The truth is that either openly or secretly, the average soldier the world over regarded religion, during the war, as a 'dud.' I believe he has held the same opinion, less openly, since the war."[1]

The churches are singled out because they, more than any other organizations, represent the great

[1] *What Is Religion Doing to Stop War?* Major General John F. O'Ryan, Church Peace Union.

bulk of the world's idealism. The Church has no exclusive proprietorship of ethical principles; indeed idealism is often found even among groups that are definitely anti-church, if not anti-religious. Among the Russian youth there is exhibited an idealistic concept of life, a willingness to work for the common good at the expense of individual comfort, an eagerness to suffer and a willingness to die "for the cause." This is exactly the same thing that was exemplified in the early Church and which led its enemies to recognize in the end that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church."

There can be no doubt, an idealistic concept has led millions of the German people to accept even the harshest rules that have been promulgated by the State. On the other hand, among the churches and church folk themselves there has been a rebirth of idealism and a courage developed that prove to be the only force that can stop many of the wildest and meanest things being done by the Nazi rulers.

We can have world peace if we want it. The method is clear and the program is as definite as anything can possibly be. Millions of people throughout the world believe this, and even with all the dark pictures that are being painted and the gloom which covers the international sky, more people are working for peace than ever before. More organizations are doing their utmost and there

is a closer coordination of effort. In spite of everything being done we are forced to recognize, however, that the peace movement as such is a failure up to now. Since 1918 governments and governmental agencies have failed also. There is a deep-seated sense of frustration, but the people are not defeated in their will for peace and their purpose to achieve it. In countries where the dangers seem the greatest, the people are determined that at whatever cost and however long it takes, war and war-making shall be defeated. The following letter relates to the situation in France:

A disgusting campaign is being made against us, against the International Peace Campaign and every leader in the movement. It consists in saying that both the movement and the leaders are Communists. It is false, it is stupid, but it is doing much harm because people are ignorant of the true facts. You know what it is since the same people, the munitionaires and others of their kind, say that President Roosevelt is a Communist. Peace they want to kill and they want to wipe out all those who work for peace; in fact, peace is in danger.

Germany and Italy are doing their best to have a war. Many newspapers in France, England, and other places have been bought by Hitler and Mussolini. Really, one feels as if he were living among fools or mad people. We wish President Roosevelt would call all the leaders of the people throughout the world to a big conference where everyone would come with a promise to work for peace, and thus there would be established the means where a reconciliation based on justice could take place.

We pray that the churches in America may support such a conference. The news has been so distressing these last days that I am writing this as a kind of SOS to you and my other friends in America. I feel sure you will understand.

Our government is really and honestly doing the best it can, but you cannot imagine the fearful fight Blum has to go through with all the munitions dealers; as we say in France, *les puissances d'argent*, against him. Everything would go beautifully if these enemies of democracy could be removed from our path.

In spite of all these difficulties, we feel that the task of those who claim to be the servants of democracy and of brotherhood is to resist with all their might, however hard the sacrifice may be. When we shall have fought until the end, if we are defeated, we shall know that we have done our utmost to save mankind from another horrible war. It is in this spirit that we go on, although sometimes we feel discouraged. May God prevent us from deserting the place He has assigned to us.

The issues of peace and war rest finally upon the judgment and action of the individual. Democratic government has failed because people have been interested in other things and not primarily in their own government. They are tired out by the responsibility of self-government. We have listened too much to those who would frighten us. We are betrayed by those who claim that they are for peace, but want something utterly impossible. "I hate war as much as any man who ever lived, but I know that peace cannot be secured except

as the nations prepare themselves for war. Let's be realistic about this matter and not make any false moves." This is the statement of an army officer. Many intelligent people are living in daily fear of what has become known as the "Red Menace" which threatens our nation. It is claimed that there is a Red Network in the United States which reaches down to every block of every city. These stories are based for the most part upon sheer imagination. Statements which purport to come from official sources to support nonsensical scare schemes and trumped-up nightmares when traced back are found almost without exception to have in them a very small proportion, if any substance, of truth. They are devised to frighten the American people and are based on the wildest kind of assumptions. The advocate of peace is said to be working in the interest of Moscow. Because he wants to reduce armaments and support the League of Nations, he is helping to make it easy for Communism and communistic agencies to conquer our nation. Granted Communism is threatening static forms of government, the fight against Communism should be a fight against those principles and practices in the various nations that lead the people to revolt against popular government and permit Communism to have its way. The last election, which showed that the Communist vote of the United States is less than 100,000, ought to reassure us.

A writer in an English paper, commenting on the election, said: "I think it is absolutely true that the election of President Roosevelt and the attitude of the American people thereafter in accepting the situation is the strongest rebuke that both Communism and Fascism have received in our day. Democracy vindicated itself in the Western hemisphere."

When President Roosevelt was given his great ovation in Buenos Aires at the opening of the Pan-American Conference and his words were carried over the radio to the whole world, he was speaking not primarily as the President of the United States but represented in a larger way the voice of democracy in the midst of the babble and turmoil of the voices of confusion, war and destruction.

The struggle for democracy and against war is going on and the victory will be won. However, just in proportion as the churches succeed in this program, in that proportion we hear a rising criticism that the Church "ought to attend to its own business. It has something more to do than simply wash pots and kettles for the politicians. It cannot afford to lower itself by attempting to solve economic problems and to secure justice and righteousness among the nations. A League of Churches to parallel the League of Nations means that the Church is putting itself on the same plane with political machinery."

Is the Church a spent force? Religion is fighting for its life on every front, but religion has always had to fight for its life. The Church as an institution has always been feeble compared to the forces against which it has fought. We must grant that in the very beginning, but does this mean that religion today is so weak and helpless that you can expect nothing from it? If this is true, then why demand that the churches exert themselves to prevent war? If the Church cannot do anything, certainly it cannot be blamed if nothing is done? Can the Church translate its idealism into a practical program? Can idealism effect changes through following a realistic course of action?

CHAPTER TWO

LET'S BE REALISTIC

A GROUP of business men sitting around a table in a metropolitan club of New York were discussing the ruling of the Supreme Court which nullified the "Child Labor Law." There was considerable difference of opinion expressed, but for the most part the group agreed with the court. However, an aggressive few contended vigorously against the folly of a nation allowing its social welfare and its future to be sacrificed to what amounts to mere legal technicalities. "The fortunes of the Republic are in the hands of the children of today and if we do not protect them by the most stringent laws they will be sacrificed to the gods of greed." "Nonsense," replied a banker who was perhaps the best known and richest of the group, "all this talk about the evils of child labor is poppycock. When I was a boy on the farm in Iowa there was no one worrying about how many hours a day I worked. From the time I was eight years old I did my full share, and none of the hard work of those days harmed me any. Work built me up physically —it taught me most of what I know today. It is the

sentimentalists and softies who are ruining our business and threatening the future of our nation. Let's be realistic—it's not child labor but child idleness that is the curse of today."

When a study was made of the steel industry nearly a generation ago and the facts were published, thousands of people learned for the first time that the laborers in the great steel plants were working twelve hours a day, seven days a week. Agitation began at once for a change. The program adopted was "an eight-hour day and one day's rest in seven." Pressure was brought to bear to suppress the groups urging these reforms. To advocate the eight-hour day and one day's rest in seven was to mark one down thirty years ago as "a Socialist and an Anarchist." The "Reds" of today are no more hated and feared than were the men and women who stood firm a generation ago. "Let's be realistic" said their critics. "We must make steel, and steel cannot be made unless the furnaces run night and day. The twelve-hour day is a necessary part of the production of steel."

In the consideration of international affairs we find someone always urging "let's be realistic." Japan made an incident and then proceeded to invade Chinese territory, murdering thousands of defenceless civilians "in behalf of law and order." The world was urged to "be realistic" and consider all the facts in the case.

Mussolini, taking his cue from Japan and in defiance of public opinion, set out to conquer Ethiopia.

His excuse was that he needed the territory. The plea of Italy that she has a "mission" to civilize backward people was made false by the methods used in Ethiopia. The land was conquered by poison gas. There were no actual battles, only a series of air raids. "Let's be realistic," urge the nations with empires to protect, the men with money to loan, the companies with oil and machinery to sell. Ethiopia under the Negus was a negligible factor in world affairs. Her trade with outside nations was almost nothing. She has great unexploited resources that will now be made available.

The same plea, "let's be realistic," is made in regard to disarmament, the League of Nations, the question of Collective Security, Preparedness, the World Court, and the sanctity of treaties. Let's consider what this plea, which we so constantly hear, really means.

The philosophy of "every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost" has penetrated deeply into our common life. Consider the facts of child labor. Conditions are vastly different in our modern urban civilization from what they were on an Iowa farm forty or fifty years ago. Idleness and lack of opportunities for normal recreation and

play are in large part responsible for the appalling rise in juvenile delinquency. Could some method be devised by which the city boy and girl could have a limited amount of responsibility for certain tasks, like those called "chores" on the farm, it would be helpful to all and the salvation of many. But putting children eight to sixteen years of age into the factory is not the answer. There is no one of any consequence or with any degree of knowledge who dares to make an open and frank argument for child labor; but thousands of those who profit by the toil of the young and find a fruitful source of cheap labor among the children of the poor seek to discredit every effort to protect childhood by picturing those who advocate this reform as being dreamers and fanatics while they are in truth the realists who face facts and know best what is good for children and young people. Their arguments and their assumptions mask an ignorance of all social values and yet they have so wide an influence that they can thwart nearly every effort at social reform. The protection of women, the minimum wage, the right of workers to organize, and other social security measures have at some time been defeated by these tactics. We are living under a democratic form of government and defeat today may very likely become victory tomorrow. This truth is proved in the general

movement for shorter hours and better pay in all industries.

Too often the appeal "let's be realistic" is an appeal to sheer selfishness. We have had and will always have to consider and contend with the age-long clash between the idealist and the realist. The answer to every serious question is conditioned by the type of mind of the one who gives the answer. Few idealists appreciate the value of the realists' point of view, and it is rarely that one finds a realist who can even tolerate an idealist. Hamilton Holt said recently: "The idealist can think but cannot act; the realist can act but cannot think." Dr. James Walsh, of Fordham College, says: "Cervantes gave the world the greatest definition of the difference between the idealist and the realist when he pictured the idealist Don Quixote, the knight, riding ahead on his charger and his servant Sancho Panza, the realist, riding behind on his donkey." And Dr. William P. Merrill tells the story of an efficiency expert who was engaged to survey the work of an orchestra and make suggestions for its improvement and more efficient management. After a long and detailed study the expert reported that one way to save money would be to dismiss the bass drummer, for "during the last concert he had struck his drum only three times." There is no way by which this clash can be avoided, but we do know the dreamer needs the doer of deeds while

the doer of deeds needs the dreamer, and the world needs them both.

A visit to the Patent Office in Washington is a worthwhile and amusing experience. If you can remember your most fantastic dream and can reduce it to some mechanical design, you probably would find that some genius had been ahead of you and had already filed a patent on your idea. Patents have been granted for machines and contrivances for almost every imaginable purpose. The great mass of them are of no practical value—most of them are the concrete expression of some idealist's dream. The realist would like to put a censor in the front office with authority to submit every device to a committee of experts and if in their opinion the machine or formula presented was of no practical value it could be rejected, thus saving time and money for the inventor and space and service on the part of the government. But what a lot of useful and even necessary adjuncts of our present-day life would have been lost if such a censor had been appointed, say, seventy-five years ago.

As I write, I have before me an encyclopedia printed in 1877. In it is a short article on the telephone in which it is stated: "The human voice has been sent over a wire and heard distinctly at the *incredible distance of two miles.*" Then there follows a short description of the technical means by which this miracle was wrought. The article ends

with this bit of prophetic wisdom: "This discovery will properly excite interest but all scientists agree that it will never be perfected to such a degree as to be of any particular commercial value."

One of the first ships driven by a steam engine to cross the Atlantic is reported to have carried as a part of its cargo a consignment of books written by a scientist proving conclusively that no ship could ever make the voyage under steam, for the amount of coal required would be greater than the space available for storing it away. Mathematics is the only exact science but as yet we find no one who is willing to trust the final answer for his most important problems to mathematics. The things that are most worthwhile cannot be reduced to an equation. The realists would have prevented us from having electric lights, telephones, telegraphs, gramophones, radios, automobiles, airplanes, airships, and steam heat and air-conditioning in our homes. In fact, none of these things were possible except for the persistence of the idealist. On the other hand, without the realist many of these grandiose dreams would never have been realized and so we need both the dreamer and the doer.

Einstein in an address given before the Franklin Institute on April 24, 1936, said some things that even ordinary mortals can understand. Among other statements was this important one: "The aim of science is, on the one hand, a comprehension as

complete as possible of the connection between the sense experiences in their totality, and, on the other hand, the accomplishment of this aim by the use of a minimum of primary concepts and relations, seeking, as far as possible, logical unity in the world picture."

When we apply this to international relations what is the answer? The student of world affairs finds himself wandering blindfolded in the midst of a vast plain where there are no frontiers simply because there is nothing but frontiers. We have reduced government in the city and the individual state to a science. We have brought into a comprehensive whole our experiences and integrated them into a picture we call the community. Unrelated or loosely related personal units have been molded into a civic and federal unity. We have order instead of chaos, law instead of anarchy. But in that larger realm of international interests and obligations we find only chaos and anarchy. For the privilege of living in a peaceful community, the individual has had to subordinate his free individual likes and dislikes to the group interest. A group of rugged individualists each so rugged that he has no consideration for anyone else can never be a community no matter how many laws may be passed nor how many people live together. Law and order means a limitation of the freedom of each for the privilege of gaining the good and

security of the many in a community of interests. The man who refuses to recognize and abide by this principle is an enemy of the common good. He puts his own selfish interests above everything else. There is a place in the sun for only one and he is that one. He scorns the idealists and shouts "let's be realistic about this matter. I am stronger than others. I do not need anything the community can give me, so why waste time trying to put over something that only weaklings and softies need and want?"

We have learned how to deal with this type of citizen in our local and state communities. The police, the law courts and jails supplement what moral suasion cannot effect.

With the tragic failure of the League machinery to prevent aggression and the collapse which followed, we are having dinned into our ears more than ever, "Now that idealism won't do, let's be realistic. Goodwill is moonshine. The only way to peace is through the exercise of force. Let's be selfish. Safety first is the only rule worth adopting." Of course, this concept appeals to human nature. It is not difficult to be selfish. Provincialism is widespread because it is natural. The nations are adopting the role of Chantecler and each one firmly believes that its crowing directs the rising of the sun, and, like Chantecler, is convinced that the dunghill

on which it stands is the greatest mountain range in the whole landscape.

Idealists in all the countries agree in their diagnosis of the malady. Even the militarists lack the face to demand bigger armies, navies and air forces for aggressive purposes, but excuse their continued and expanded preparation for war on the ground that the selfishness of other powers will not permit them to cut down their armaments and war drill.

"The education of the intelligence is comparatively easy. But the formation of the moral, esthetic and religious activities is very difficult. The influence of environment on these aspects of consciousness is much more subtle. No one can learn to distinguish right from wrong and beauty from vulgarity by taking a course of lectures. Morality, art and religion are not taught like grammar, mathematics and history. To feel and to know are two profoundly different moral states."[1]

The evil is primarily a spiritual one and can be eradicated only by the creation of a new spirit. This new spirit has been developed in our community life. But here we have dealt with individuals. The appeal to Tom Jones is easier to make than to Tom Jones' nation. Tom Jones can be influenced by his neighbors and if he remains stubborn he can be put in jail, but his nation is not so open to a

[1] *Man the Unknown*, Carrel, p. 151, published by Harper & Brothers.

moral appeal, and if it refuses to follow reason and becomes a disturber of the peace, it cannot very well be put into the calaboose. However difficult it may be, this is the task to which humanity must turn its hands. To believe it can be done is to class oneself as an idealist; to work for this end is to write oneself down, as we shall see, a realist.

CHAPTER THREE

REALISTIC PREPAREDNESS

From his earliest days on earth man has settled disputes with his neighbors by means of force. The progress of races and nations is recorded in the development of newer and more effective instruments of destruction and the better strategy and methods of warfare. War is the cord running through six thousand years of recorded history on which is strung like beads a succession of wars, while cultures have come and gone, or rather the best of one culture has merged into another. History pays more attention to the wars of Greece and Rome than to the art and culture of either. Pick up any book which gives the outline story of European history and you will find almost exclusively a series of war stories. You will also find that each war sowed the seed for the next. Another fact which becomes clear is that it is almost impossible to make a just settlement and establish peace after a great war. Hate and revenge sit in the best seats at every peace conference and dictate the terms of settlement. The defeated enemy is charged, of course, with full responsibility for starting the

war and by the terms of peace is crippled so that henceforth he will not become a new danger to the victor. A few times there have been sincere efforts to establish peace on the broad basis of justice but they have been either local in their application or dictated, as were the terms of the Holy Alliance by the "Trinity and the Czar of all the Russias." In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost the three great Powers of Europe declared their intention and purpose to fix once and for all time the status of the other nations and their relations to each other. The Alliance failed, as all other agreements and treaties have failed, because as soon as one war was ended the nations began to prepare for another. "In time of peace, prepare for war" sets up the expectation of another war and the world has never been disappointed in its fulfillment.

It has been said: "Man is the only animal who never learns anything from his past experiences." This would seem to be fully proven in our attitude toward war, for a common dictum has it that "only idealists can believe that it is safe for a nation to utilize the period of peace as a time for making peace permanent." Only twice in the history of Rome were the doors of the temple of Janus closed, thus signifying that the empire was at peace. During such a period, when Augustus reigned, Rome reached the zenith of her glory. Oppression, bloodshed and slavery came to an end, while peace, plenty

and happiness filled the land. This short period of less than half a century produced a Golden Age. The development of art, science, literature and the improvement of human welfare were so remarkable that one of the greatest of the poets wrote: "Ceres and bounteous blessings cheer our farms; our sailors speed o'er seas infested by no pirates; credit is kept unspotted; crime is checked; family life purified; none fear invasion; each man closes a peaceful day on his native hills, trains his vines, and home returning, light of heart, quaffs his wine and blesses you as his God."[1]

This picture of Rome could be taken as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Micah: "He shall judge among many people and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid." (Micah 4:3.) If the hope of peace and the blessings it promises are unreal, then the whole judgment of history must be reversed, for in the two periods of peace in the annals of the greatest and most warlike people of antiquity, when preparation for war was subordinated to the pursuits and enjoyment of civil life, the nation prospered and became truly great. With the

[1] Letter from Horace to the Emperor Augustus.

return of war Rome slipped into decay and went down defeated by stronger forces. The prophet points out the concrete and practicable methods for attaining the result desired. First, disarmament. The nations must get rid of their war weapons. Second, the nations must stop all military training. No more R.O.T.C. (Reserve Officers Training Corps) in our schools and colleges. Let the military schools train the soldiers necessary for policing our frontiers, but the people must not "learn war any more."

There is nothing novel or controversial in the statement that war is hateful. All agree that it is a terrible thing. There is no need to argue the question. War is an unmitigated evil, the greatest curse of all the ages and the chief enemy of man. All of this goes without saying. Every nation and everybody of any importance hates and denounces war, with the possible exception of Mussolini who alone since the World War has glorified war and boasted of it as a part of Italian national policy. The reason that nations continue to prepare for war is that all are now living in a state of fear and not one of them dares pay the price of peace. The word security has taken the place of the word peace in international discussions. Granted that it is the function of government to protect the lives and property of its citizens, I think the use of the term security goes beyond this idea. For instance, when France talks of security along the Rhine it is not

so much the life and property of the French citizens at stake as the territory that belongs to France. It is largely a question of national prestige. The people living on each side of national borders have no hatred for each other. It is, however, along these frontiers that the antagonisms are most strongly felt. The people are the spearheads in the outburst of Nationalism from the capitals. This question of security came to be a paramount issue in the Geneva Disarmament Conference when Germany demanded "equality of treatment" with the other nations and France countered by demanding "security." By "equality" Germany meant the right to rearm in proportion as the other nations were armed. By this demand Germany announced to the world that she would no longer be bound by restrictions that do not apply equally to all other nations.

After the Armistice France began building up her defenses until today she has a powerful army, a strong navy and an efficient air force, to which she is constantly adding new units. In addition, she has built a line of forts or strongholds along her whole northern and eastern frontier. She feels fairly secure with this preparedness for another attack from across the Rhine. She is as secure as she can make herself providing Germany is not permitted to build up her army and navy and fortify her side of the common frontier. This is exactly what Ger-

many demanded and it was the impasse thus created which broke down the Disarmament Conference. Later when Germany marched her soldiers into the Rhineland and on her own authority declared the demilitarized zone abolished, she defined in action exactly what she meant by her words before the Disarmament Conference.

Germany is now fortifying the Rhineland and day by day is increasing her military and aerial forces. Where lies security in such a proceeding? The impasse continues and this further question still remains to be answered: "How can nations guarantee the security of their citizens and their lives and property?" Surely it is false realism to trust to a worn-out formula of force. The war system offers no help. Anyone must see after the experiences of these fateful years that preparedness for war means more soldiers, more guns, more warships, more airplanes, more forts, more poison gas, and more danger of war and less security for the average man, woman or child than ever before in the whole history of the world.

In a recent issue of *The Observer*, Mr. J. L. Garvin, of London, suggests that the British Government "enter into negotiations for the settlement of the American debt." However, he does not raise the usual question of whether or not the debt ought to be paid. With him the payment of the debt is merely or largely a matter of expediency. Great

Britain is not arming fast enough and does not possess the equipment or resources to match the other nations in their preparation for war. Great Britain needs credit, tools, machinery and war materials that only America can supply in sufficient quantities to give the Empire the needed superiority when war breaks out. This statement reflects an accurate picture of the mind of all the European nations. The race for supremacy is on in dead earnest. New alliances are being forced; new partners chosen. Moral issues are obscured and public opinion is almost completely ignored.

Most of the representatives present in Geneva felt a deep humiliation and shame as the pathetic little figure of the fallen Emperor of Ethiopia appeared before the Council of the League of Nations. These were his friends, but they could not or did not help him. The barbarity and brutal lessons of Italian Fascism were given a full demonstration when the Italian newspapermen, privileged guests at the Council meeting, booed and hissed the speech of the fallen monarch. What makes it more ominous is that Rome was reported to have championed these correspondents and protested against their arrest and expulsion from Switzerland by the government authorities. This incident, followed closely by Dr. Greiser, president of the Danzig Senate, who thumbed his nose (literally) at the Council in concluding his defiant address, indicates the low

estate to which the League of Nations has fallen. Japan, Germany and Italy utterly flout its authority.

A year ago when Greiser came before the League he was the picture of humble subserviency. The change from "boot licking" to "nose thumbing" in this case was national, not personal. It was Germany, not Greiser, who scorned the League. Where then is our security?

There has been no serious check on the plans of any nation in preparing for war. Never have such colossal sums been appropriated for war purposes. The statistics available indicate the sums reported[2] but these do not tell the whole story.

In the House of Commons on July 19, 1936, Mr. Winston Churchill asked whether it is true that Germany spent 800 million pounds Sterling (4 billion dollars) on her armament in 1935. In reply Mr. Neville Chamberlain said: "The government has not the official figures but on the basis of the information which we possess I see no reason to doubt that the figure indicated by Mr. Churchill is excessive."

Sir Thomas Inskip, the Minister for Unified Defense, recently demanded an addition of 100 million dollars to the already enormous appropriation for war purposes for the current year. France, Russia, Italy, Japan, China and nearly all the small nations are voting larger sums for "preparedness"

[2] See Appendix No. 1.

than ever before in peace time. Add to this the total appropriations of over a billion dollars for the United States for the current year of 1936 and the grand total will certainly mount to 10 billion dollars, if not more. What for? To make the world safe against war? Not at all, but for another and greater war that will involve all nations. To quote Sir Thomas Inskip: "The armaments have but one end in view, defense only," but this statement was in answer to a reproach from the Labor members in Parliament that England had abandoned the political principle of collective security so as to be free to begin a campaign of increased armaments.

If this is realism and the men who in all nations are responsible for our security are realists, how would one define insanity? Take America as an illustration. Our nation has declared that she will under no conditions take part in another war. Congress has voted a strict neutrality bill which will make it very difficult for us to take sides in any conflict outside of our own land. At the same time we have voted for as large a navy as any in the world and have war plans and the strategy for the next war all mapped out. The War Department is fighting strenuously to extend military training into all our colleges and high schools. Why? We have no enemies on our borders and if we are to remain neutral in case of war surely we do not need

a preparation for war equal to that of any other nation.

The race in military and naval preparedness prior to 1914 led to the World War. The men who called themselves "realists" had their way then and have been in control ever since. They are the ones who wrecked the world's credit, brought disaster upon all nations and have kept us in the midst of misery and woe all these years! They have opposed every effort to change the old discredited war system and have utilized, as we will show in later chapters, even the basest and most dastardly methods to wreck every genuine effort for establishing peace and goodwill among men.

Is it not time to consider a truly realistic program of preparedness? Such a program should be based upon the agreement among the nations that never again under any circumstances will a nation send an army across its borders to fight in the territory of another nation. Each nation will then determine for itself what forces and weapons are necessary for the maintenance of internal law and order and for a frontier control. This is the essence of the Briand-Kellogg Pact and if the sixty odd nations which signed it would agree to this further step the pact would solve for the whole world the problem of national and international security.

CHAPTER FOUR

REALISTIC DISARMAMENT

It is more difficult to write or speak calmly and wisely on the question of disarmament than on almost any other subject in the whole range of international affairs. This is primarily true because of the innate complexity of the problems involved. When we see the trend of armaments and the disastrous effect on good relations between the nations, we wonder why intelligent statesmen do not put a stop to the whole system. When we study a little deeper and see how the question of armament has wound itself into the very fabric of national life and international contacts, we wonder how any statesman or group of statesmen can ever do anything worthwhile about it. Professor Shotwell refers to the efforts for reduction of armaments during the past fifteen years as amateurish. But at least the amateurs on the job have been the ablest statesmen the nations could provide. The problem, as Shotwell points out, is extremely complicated. He says: "The nations which have been studying this problem have at last come back to the starting point that national security must be safeguarded

in other ways than by armaments, or armaments will continue as its outward and visible sign."[1]

Disarmament is the necessary process through which peace can be established. The nations at the end of the war in 1918 recognized clearly and stated definitely that wars grow out of preparation for "national defense." Therefore, in order to avoid future wars, the nations declared their intention to disarm. The Treaty of Versailles declares that the Allies have disarmed Germany "to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of the armaments of all nations." A covering letter to the German delegation further explained the intended general limitation and reduction of armaments on the part of the Allies. In this letter it is stated: "German disarmament is regarded as the first step towards the reduction and limitation of armaments which they (the Allies) seek to bring about as one of the most fruitful preventives of war, and which it will be one of the first duties of the League of Nations to promote." In Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations it is stated: "The members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations." Then follows a series of five para-

[1] *On the Rim of the Abyss*, p. 277, Shotwell, published by Macmillan Co.

graphs detailing ways and means by which this plan can be made effective. There was no difference of opinion at that time in regard to the necessity of disarmament. The lessons of the war and the causes which led to it were fresh in the minds of men. Today we face a different psychology. The nations which now condemn Italy and Japan for their unprovoked aggressions and look with fear upon the rearmament of Germany are unwilling to face the tragic fact that they are among the leaders in the new race of armaments. The nations, including the United States, who sat in judgment upon Japan were for the most part heavily armed nations. Every disarmament conference has failed because the delegates represent powers that have built up their national defences to such an extent that they themselves feel secure and are not willing to sacrifice a single tank, gun, warship, bombing plane or reduce the size of their armies without agreements that would virtually divide the world into huge armed camps. This is not disarmament. This is simply a reshuffling of old cards. What has been discussed has been a new deal in old armaments. Disarmament is sought by new balances of power and new treaties of mutual assistance based on military and naval force. No wonder every effort at disarmament since the end of the world war has ended in an increase in arms. This does not necessarily mean that no efforts have been

made to bring about a reduction and limitation of armaments. In fact quite the contrary is true. No one subject has received so much attention and on no other problem has more serious and sincere thought been expended. The failure has come from inherent difficulties and from the further fact which we are coming gradually to recognize—namely, that a nation can afford to give up its private means of defence only in proportion as the community of nations becomes a living reality.

This carries us back to the parallel between the World Community of Nations and the local community. In frontier days before there was developed a real community with its laws and law offices, its jail, its police and its courthouse, every man was a "law unto himself." Every man carried a gun and was ready at all times to defend himself. As the forces of law and order became better established and public opinion was developed, it was possible and became necessary to disarm the private citizen. International relations are today in a frontier state of existence. The efforts that have been made to set up the world community and give it the organs necessary for its existence have been weak and half-hearted in comparison with the overwhelming needs and demands. The building of the World Community demands for its success whole-hearted support from all nations. Later on, when we consider the League of Nations, we will be able to

show that two things militated against it from the very first. One was that the conquering nations would not admit the conquered, and second, that the United States would not accept the invitation to join. Another requisite is that just in proportion as the World Community becomes strong, in that proportion the nations should give up their means of carrying on private war. This was the fatal error which has led to the present debacle. When the nations agree to settle their disputes by peaceful means, there can be no reservation that permits them to go on arming for war if peaceful means fail. As long as they do this, war will always defeat the peaceful agencies. It is not difficult to make war. The use of force is natural and those who furnish the means for making force effective have a huge stake in the continuance of the war system. International war has become a racket. The makers and sellers of munitions, those who provide means of transportation, the makers of uniforms and all the other accessories of modern warfare, make great profits out of the enterprise. The nations themselves use arms as a yardstick in measuring their national greatness. The soldier, the sailor, and their commanders are a part of a worldwide diplomatic set-up. Flags, uniforms, decorations, martial bands, stir the emotions and help to decide issues by means more easily understood than arguments based on reason and common sense.

Difficult as the task may be it is one that must be faced. Collectively the nations have by means of their war preparation built up a "Frankenstein," a monster that is now out of control and threatens to destroy its creators. The best men in all the nations recognize this fact and although it may seem that nothing has been done, the reverse is quite true. For the most part the people who discuss the question of disarmament fall into two types—those who expect too little to be done and those who expect too much. The former are likely to overestimate what has been accomplished and the latter constantly belittle every effort no matter how sincerely it has been made. In the interests of realism let's take a look at what has been tried and accomplished since 1918 and then attempt an estimate of the present juncture of affairs.

Early in February of 1921 the League of Nations appointed a "Temporary Mixed Commission," that is, one made up of both civil and military leaders. Lord Robert Cecil (now Viscount Cecil) was the most prominent member and did a large share of the work. After long debate and discussion this Commission formulated and presented to the League of Nations a set of principles which must be fundamental to any substantial progress toward general disarmament. The League made this memorandum a subject of major interest in the 3rd Assembly and finally adopted what came to be

popularly known as Resolution Number 14. This resolution, in substance, lays down these propositions as a fundamental working basis:

1. Disarmament must be general and universal in order to be successful.
2. Disarmament must be based upon a common consideration of security.
3. Security must be guaranteed by other powers. This proposition became the basis for the discussion which led to the coining and general use of the term "Collective Security."
4. Such guarantees are based on defensive agreements by League members against an aggressor. Such a provision takes into account those states where there is special and particular danger.
5. Disarmament will be best secured through progressive reduction and limitation of armaments. This proposal led to a great deal of argument later in the preparatory work done prior to the meeting of the Geneva Disarmament Conference in 1932. Russia proposed that the basis of discussion should be "total and immediate disarmament." The more moderate view prevailed and the Geneva Conference was not a "Disarmament Conference" but a "Conference on the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments."

After the meeting of the League Assembly in 1922, the Mixed Commission continued its work on the basis of "Resolution Number 14" and elaborated a plan that came to be known as the "Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance." This treaty was debated in the House of Commons and flatly rejected

by the Labor Government on the grounds that it was merely a scheme to guarantee the status quo and instead of making possible a general disarmament provided for the use of additional armed force, to almost any degree, in resisting aggression. It was interpreted as a new and more comprehensive defensive alliance dressed in new clothes. It was just such an alliance as France had proposed to America and England at the Paris Conference and which had been definitely turned down.

The Draft Treaty was followed by a new proposal worked out by Herriot and MacDonald which provided an almost iron-clad agreement for joint action against any aggressor. This document, known as "The Geneva Protocol," was discussed in the League Assembly of 1924. It provided a system for conciliation, arbitration and the judicial settlement of all disputes and names as the aggressor "that nation which refuses to arbitrate its dispute." This is the first attempt to define aggression. The Geneva Protocol puts a new emphasis on Article XVI of the League Covenant relative to sanctions and provides appropriate economic and military sanctions against any nation refusing an offer of arbitration. The Protocol was to take effect only after a successful disarmament conference had been held. Such a conference was proposed in 1925.

Meanwhile the Labor Government in England had fallen and the Conservatives had come into

power. The Protocol was fiercely attacked by the British both at Geneva and in the House of Commons in London. It was said that such a set of agreements would put impossible restrictions upon British freedom. The Protocol was rejected but the discussions incident to its creation and rejection advanced the cause of disarmament a step farther. Men like Benes of Czechoslovakia and Politis of Greece gave fuller expression to the point of view of the smaller nations and on the whole the problems involved in European peace were made much clearer.

Now let's see where we stand at the beginning of 1925.

These definite propositions were accepted almost as axiomatic!

1. Disarmament to be effective must be general and universal.
2. Disarmament must be based on security from aggression.
3. An aggressor nation is that nation which refuses arbitration.
4. A dispute between two nations can be settled only by the appeal to or intervention of some third party.

Out of all this discussion and on the ruins of the Treaty for Mutual Assistance and the Geneva Protocol grew the Locarno Treaty. The conference, held on the shores of this lake in southern Switzerland near the Italian border, worked out a

most comprehensive system for the settlement of all disputes between Germany, France, Czechoslovakia, Belgium and Poland. The treaties signed October 16, 1925, are independent and yet are all bound together in one general system for preserving the peace in Central and Western Europe. The treaties are guaranteed by the signatures of Great Britain, Belgium, France, Germany and Italy, which make these nations also parties to the general plan. The Locarno treaties are based upon and incorporate the four principles as stated herein which grew out of the work of the Mixed Commission and the discussions in the League Assembly. The treaties continued as the basis of the peace of Europe until the year 1936 when Hitler, in complete disregard of consequences, marched his troops into the Rhineland. The world waited long an answer from Germany to the questions that England proposed to Hitler regarding his attitude toward the Locarno treaties. Great Britain, Belgium and France addressed a conciliatory message to Italy, Germany and the other Locarno Powers but the proposals made were not accepted and no successful conference, "a second Locarno," could be held.

The Sixth Assembly of the League in 1925 created a Preparatory Commission for a disarmament conference, made up of representatives of the states having a seat in the Council of the League and in addition one representative each from Russia, Tur-

key and the United States of America. The first meeting of the Commission was held May 13, 1926. First of all a questionnaire was sent out to all governments asking for answers in regard to the present status of armaments and a large number of other technical questions. Six sessions of the Commission were held and finally on the basis of the answers to the questionnaire and further information received, a preliminary "Draft Convention" was drawn up. It provided for the calling of a Disarmament Conference and suggested as the basis of discussion the following subjects:

1. Budgetary Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.
2. Reduction and Limitation of Materials of War.
3. The Establishment of a Permanent Disarmament Commission within the League of Nations or under its Supervision.

No one was satisfied with the Draft Convention. It was sketchy and offered a limited scope for the discussion of an infinite variety of questions that were certain to arise. Germany and Russia were agreed that the draft offered no hopeful or helpful basis of discussion. However, owing to the serious economic condition throughout the world and the pressing need for something to be done, the draft was accepted with the understanding that it might be changed and improved if the Conference, when it met, so desired.

This brings us then to February 2, 1932. But we

need to retrace our path to consider two other movements which have a vital bearing upon this whole discussion. One is the refusal of the United States to join the League, and the other the Washington Conference of 1921-22.

The refusal of America to join the League of Nations was a severe blow to the infant organization. It amazed and mystified the nations with whom the United States was associated in the war. The greater part of the obligations assumed under the Covenant depended for their fulfillment upon the cooperation of all the nations. These obligations were undertaken on the assumption that America would accept membership in this new peace agency which her negotiators at Paris had been so eager and insistent on creating. The United States was counted upon to help carry out the plan for general worldwide disarmament and particularly to support Articles X and XVI in the League Covenant which provide penalties for an aggressor nation. It was also believed that the United States would sign a special treaty with Great Britain, guaranteeing by specific agreements and pledges further security for France. As to this last hope on the part of the Allies, especially on the part of France, it was fantastic. Public opinion, neither in America nor in Great Britain, would agree to such a commitment. It was widely believed, however, in both nations that the Covenant of the League

adequately covered the question of security for all. The nations were justified in feeling that America lamentably failed them for no one had any doubt that America believed in sanctions. The "League to Enforce Peace," an American institution which was used as a pattern for the League of Nations, had embedded in its very foundation that force must be available for the punishment of international lawbreakers. In all of the American discussions the word force was emphasized. The absence of her representatives from Geneva and the bitter controversy over the League in the United States crippled all efforts to achieve anything like the progress that would have been possible had America been present and heartily cooperating in the League activities.

The Washington Naval Conference which began in November, 1921, and lasted until the following February, provided the setting for one of the most dramatic incidents of modern times. The Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, Secretary of State, in opening the conference electrified the delegates by proposing not an agenda to be adopted but a complete scheme in the name of the United States whereby the great naval powers should halt immediately all building programs, should agree upon a minimum of naval strength and should then proceed to destroy a percentage of vessels already built. Seventy vessels either built or being built were

destroyed under this provision. The ratio of 5:5:3 was agreed upon, that is, America and Britain were allowed each equal war equipment on the sea. The basis of this was taken as the number 5. Japan, in relation to the others, would be permitted a ratio of 3 to 5. In the political field the conference evolved two important treaties: "The Four Power Pact" relating to island possessions in the Pacific and "The Nine Power Treaty" guaranteeing the integrity of China. The conference made a deep impression and set a new standard for such ventures. Here was courage and energetic determination to do a thing that all knew needed to be done. It is true that in attacking the capital ships the conference, from a technical standpoint, found its task comparatively easy. The outstanding achievement was that at this conference, for the first time in history, was established the principle of agreed international reduction and limitation of armaments. The conference failed to reach agreement regarding submarines, destroyers and cruisers. Only five powers were represented at Washington, further conferences were projected and held but none of them had any marked success.

The conference at Geneva in 1927 was convened by the United States and held outside League auspices. It was a dismal failure. Here was shown in its most glaring form the lengths to which the war-makers will go to protect their interests.

Shearer, an American adventurer who was later exposed by President Hoover, boasted that he killed the Geneva conference. The real reason for the failure was that the United States and Great Britain could not agree on the question of cruisers. Britain demanded a large number of small cruisers (6000 tons); America wanted a limited number but of larger size (10,000 tons). It was the British Admiralty which dictated policy and named the terms which brought about the impasse upon which the conference broke up.

Another naval conference was held in London early in 1930. The United States, Great Britain, France, Japan, and Italy took part. It ended in small agreements relating to application of the Washington Treaty and limitation of submarine and cruiser tonnage.

Meanwhile Japan denounced the treaties and so ends the agreements entered into at the Washington Conference. Japan demands parity with Great Britain and the United States but suggests a drastic reduction of naval strength. She especially urges the abolition of large cruisers and airplane carriers. Her aggression against China and the setting up of a puppet kingdom in Manchuria, together with her defiance of world public opinion and resignation from the League of Nations, make the other nations suspicious of her motives. It may be said that Japan's proposal for a reduction of naval forces was

considered a "face-saving device" and not a sincere effort on her part to be helpful in solving one of the gravest of international problems.

Another naval conference met in 1933 and after a long discussion was checked by Japan's demands and the firm refusal of Great Britain and America to meet her even half way. Japan withdrew formally from the conference but left an observer to follow events. The conference adjourned with no new agreements and since then the naval needs have been accentuated and the race in armaments is now on in full swing.

Again we turn back in our path to 1928. On August 27th of that year a pact was signed in Paris for the "Renunciation of War" worked out jointly by Foreign Secretary Aristide Briand of France and Secretary of State Frank Kellogg of the United States. This pact, known as the Pact of Paris, has been signed and ratified by sixty-three countries who declare solemnly and definitely that they:

(1) Condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce it as an instrument of national policy.
(2) Agree to the settlement of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, only by pacific means.

This pact, while not dealing definitely with the question of disarmament, implies that those nations who have pledged themselves to "renounce war as

an instrument of national policy" cannot consistently continue preparation for war. The trouble with this pact is the same as was urged against the "Holy Alliance." It is pure idealism. It contains no definite plan for making good its promises. Its chief defenders immediately emasculated the pact by providing for the exception of "defensive war" and failing to define aggression. As a gesture the pact has real value. It registers a new advance on the part of the nations. Whether they really meant what they said or not, when the nations in this generation formally and by a mutual pact "outlaw war," it means that pacifists and other anti-war groups need no longer argue that war is an unmitigated evil. It has no longer any defenders. The hand of every man and nation is against it and the chief interest of men and nations is now to find ways and means to make the waging of war impossible. This is the task that faced the Disarmament Conference when it met in Geneva, February 2, 1932.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

At last the work of the preparatory Disarmament Conference was finished and a draft convention adopted. As pointed out in the previous chapter, the results achieved were not wholly satisfactory but there was provided a basis of discussion and a platform. No matter how much skepticism there might be throughout the world as to the possibility of disarmament, Geneva was all ready on February 2, 1932, for the opening of the greatest international conference ever held. This does not mean greatest in numbers, for there have been other conventions with hundreds of thousands of delegates. You must weigh, not count, delegates if you want to determine the importance of any gathering. A milling mob intimidates through numbers; a committee impresses by its good sense and the constituency it represents. First of all, there were the official representatives of some sixty-four nations, delegated for the purpose of expressing the opinion of their various governments. Among these delegates were some four hundred diplomats, many of them the highest officials of their several coun-

tries. There were so many Prime Ministers, War Ministers, Lords of the Admiralty, Secretaries of Navies, with their Military and Naval Attaches, that one soon tired of even having them pointed out. In addition, there were two hundred and thirty official members of the various delegations—two hundred experts, specialists, and secretaries, acting as aides to these delegations. There were sixty members of the Secretariat of the conference, and approximately five hundred newspaper men, journalists and reporters. In all it was a group of about two thousand people.

This was the group that the public saw; the ones who were not ashamed to be seen and to express their opinions, to have their pictures taken, to be interviewed and let it be known that they were in Geneva interested in helping to reduce the burden of armaments, which for centuries has been the crushing load on the shoulders of humanity.

Another group however was present; not numerous, but ubiquitous and powerful, which made itself felt even before the conference convened. It was the unofficial, unclassified group representing the munition makers from America, England, Germany, France and other industrial countries. While the delegates and others were seeking a method by which recurrent problems in international life can be solved in a peaceable way, these sellers of war material, manufacturers of gunpowder, makers of

guns and instruments of war were busily spreading the information that this problem is too difficult to be solved in our generation. They laid a thick smoke screen beyond which they hoped to be able to inspire more distress than already existed. All this was done by them in order that they might protect their traffic in human blood.

It was a tragic thing that at the very time the Disarmament Conference began Japan, through her aggression against China, forced the delegates who had come together to discuss disarmament to resolve themselves into an international court to try Japan for breaking her covenant and making an unprovoked aggression against a fellow member.

When the Chinese delegates heard of the postponement of the conference they made a request, more or less serious, that a loud speaker be installed in the hall of the conference and that a hook-up be made with the battle area in Shanghai so that the delegates, as they talked reduction of arms and armed forces, could hear the roar of the Japanese cannons. It is not difficult to appreciate the irony of the situation.

The Spirit of Mars and not the spirit of Christ was present in those opening days of the conference. Mars sat not merely in his usual character as observer, but he took a real hand in affairs. One could imagine the old War God laughing; laughing at the nations for thinking that they wanted to get

rid of him, when he knew they did not; laughing as he thought of Locarno, Washington, and London and their pledges. He laughed as he repeated the solemn pledge of the nations that renounced war as a national policy and were all there in the framework of a disarmament conference actually discussing how they could helpfully cooperate to humanize and make more respectable and tolerable the next war. Yes, I am sure that Mars laughed at the conferees.

The conference finally got under way. A Bureau or Business Committee was appointed, and the conference resolved itself into a general commission with several sub-commissions dealing with specific subjects. Most of the important statements were made at meetings of these commissions.

In opening the conference, Mr. Arthur Henderson, the chairman, defined the task as follows:

(a) To arrive at a collective agreement on an effective program of practical proposals speedily to secure a substantial reduction and limitation of all national armaments.

(b) To determine that no armaments should be maintained outside the scope of the treaty, by which all nations represented at the conference would make the achievement of universal disarmament their common aim.

(c) To secure continuity of advance in disarmament by arranging for similar conferences to meet at reasonably short intervals of time.

In concluding his remarkably able and courageous address, Mr. Henderson said:

> The problem of disarmament is vitally relevant to the grave economic and financial crisis for which most nations are at the moment trying to find a solution. The financial burden of armaments and of past wars, indeed, is one of the principal causes of unbalanced budgets in a large number of countries. World opinion demands that every effort be made at this conference to achieve a substantial reduction of this prodigious expenditure. This is not only because such expenditure is entirely unproductive, but also because even the maintenance of armaments on their present level constitutes a menace to the peace of the world.

The "Draft Convention" which formed the Agenda was written in the form of a "blank" treaty. That is, it put in form all the obligations that were to be assumed, with spaces left where the actual figures relating to reductions of the present armed forces and limitations to be placed upon future armaments could be written in by general agreement before the treaty was signed. The Draft Treaty comprises sixty articles. Article I states:

> The High Contracting Parties agree to limit and, so far as possible, to reduce their respective armaments as provided in the present convention.

Its provisions are then divided in four categories: men, material, money and miscellaneous.

From the very first it became evident that the

conference would become so involved in a discussion of mathematics and definitions that no real progress could be made. For instance, on the question of man force and the number of soldiers permitted each nation—Would this apply to actual men under arms, or should trained reserves be included? The treaty excludes them, but as Germany, Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria were not allowed to conscript their military forces they objected seriously to the whole section dealing with this question. It was pointed out that France could claim a total figure large enough to include her whole annual increase as well as the total of her professional army. Thus was laid in the very first session the basis for the serious discussion of security on the part of France and equality of treatment on the part of Germany. The same differences appeared in the discussions of the other commissions. Can war material be counted in tons, horsepower, caliber of guns, without considering cost? Divergences also arose regarding how budgets are to be supervised. Are sizes of expenditures to be adopted by the nations as the basis for limitation? This is the indirect method and was supported by the United States and Great Britain, but opposed by Germany. However, Germany agreed to a combination of both direct and indirect methods of control. They were willing to limit by a mathematical yardstick, plus an agreed total annual expenditure, but not

willing to agree to a limitation alone on expenditures. Just as in the discussion of the numbers of armed forces we found that definitions which applied to one country were totally misleading as descriptive of conditions in another, so with costs. The availability of iron, copper, oil, cotton and other essential war materials control their price so that the same amount spent in one land will buy more than elsewhere. Again, wages and standards of living of workers have to be figured in as a part of all war budgets.

All of this detail may seem dry and uninteresting, but it enters vitally into an understanding of the question. Day after day and month after month the discussions wound through these mazes of difficulty. One of the first voices raised in protest against this sterile process was that of Maxim Litvinoff, representative of Soviet Russia, who strongly urged as a goal "immediate, universal, and complete disarmament." To make the matter concrete the Russian delegation proposed the following resolution:

Believing that the only effective means of contributing to the organization of peace and the establishment of security against war is the general complete and rapid abolition of all armed forces setting out from the principle of equality for all:

Convinced that the idea of general complete and rapid abolition of all armament answers to the sincere aspirations of the masses toward peace:

The Conference decides to base its work on the principle of general and complete disarmament.

This was in reality an answer to the French proposal which came at the beginning of the conference. The French proposed that all national arms and armaments should be combined and put at the service of and under the command of the League of Nations. Later France presented a further memorandum in which it was stated that France stood ready to decrease her army and navy and limit her expenditures just in proportion as the nations will organize themselves for Peace. Professor Shotwell says of this document:

> Never was the collective system of security better described than in this document, which puts in the foreground the obligations that a nation owes to the community of nations to ensure peace. It is not merely peace for itself, but peace among other nations as well, which creates that condition of security necessary for any major steps in the reduction of armaments.[1]

The delegates did not take Litvinoff seriously, but later they had reason to remember his first effort to "clear the air." He, in effect, pointed out that if we are to have peace we must get rid of all the instruments that make international war possible. Faith and confidence in each other and the pledged words of the nations must take the place of armaments and preparation for war. This state-

[1] *On the Rim of the Abyss*, p. 281.

ment brought out into the open the fact that lurked under every proposal and showed itself in every speech—that the Conference for the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments was dominated by fear and distrust. The great powers stood on one side fearful of each other, and the small powers, feeling their weakness, hardly knew what to say or which way to turn. Most of the expressed idealism was heard from the representatives of the small nations. The great powers hedged, stammered and excused themselves. Sir John Simon, speaking for Great Britain, made a speech that was so bad and revealed such a complete lack of moral courage and power of leadership that his own countrymen were ashamed. After the speech I came out into the corridor with a friend of mine, a minister from one of the European nations. I said: "Well, what do you think now of the prospect of any substantial reduction of armaments after hearing Simon?" "Wait," he replied, "here comes a representative of one of England's most liberal papers, let's ask him." We put the question to him but he countered by saying: "What do you fellows think of it?" My friend replied: "Frankly, after all we had been led to expect from England at this time and from the eloquent Sir John, his speech reminded me of the old saw 'the mountain was in travail and brought forth a mouse.' " "A mouse, did you say," interrupted the journalist, "hell, a cockroach."

The corridors were filled with rumors. Innumerable small conferences were held. We had constant rumors of agreements, but nothing happened. The scene was enlivened one afternoon when Hugh Gibson, the chief American delegate, made a speech in which he said:

> The way to disarm is to disarm. Let all nations agree that no one will make an aggressive move against another nation and on the basis of that, let's get rid of all arms and armament that would make such aggression possible. The next step will be to agree upon a minimum estimate for national security and then all of us agree to cut that estimated requirement by an agreed percentage, say twenty-five per cent.

Tardieu and some others sat amazed as they listened to Gibson. "You Americans are so sudden." But Gibson said to a group of us after the speech: "I thought the time had come to smash a few windows and let in some air. The conference is being asphyxiated." Gibson spoke upon direct orders from President Hoover and Mr. Stimson, Secretary of State. The plan became known as "The Hoover Plan for Disarmament" and gave new life and hope to the conferees. Perhaps something could be done after all.

Litvinoff, on the basis of the new turn the discussion had taken, made another significant suggestion relating to the definition of aggression. If we are to limit armaments to national defence, we

must know what we mean by aggression. The simplest form is to define "as an aggressor that nation that uses armed forces in the territory of another State regardless of the justification." This later took the form of the definition now generally adopted: "An aggressor is the nation who sends armed forces across its own border into the territory of another State for warlike purposes."

The effect of this turn in the discussion did not bring about any great change. What influence the American proposals had was soon dissipated in the humdrum discussion. Word went out that Mr. Stimson himself was coming to Geneva. Interest was stirred but when he came he did nothing and said nothing. In answer to an inquiry by an American newspaper man as to why he had come, he replied: "To carry Hugh Gibson's brief-case to and from the conference room for him."

After the American elections, when Roosevelt came into office, Mr. Norman Davis, "Ambassador at large to Europe," reaffirmed the position of the United States and added these words which advanced the stated policy of the government farther than it had ever gone before:

> We are ready not only to do our part toward the substantial reduction of armaments, but if this is effected by general international agreement, we are also prepared to contribute in other ways to the organization of peace. In particular, we are willing to consult the other States

in case of a threat to peace, with a view to averting conflict. Further than that, in the event that the States, in Conference, determine that a State has been guilty of a breach of the peace in violation of its international obligations and take measures against the violator, then, if we concur in the judgment rendered as to the responsible and guilty party, we will refrain from any action tending to defeat such collective effort which these States may thus make to restore peace.[2]

The clash between Germany and France brought new emphasis upon the words security and equality. Used by these two States, as was shown in our first chapter, the two ideas are utterly incompatible. They represent points of view that cannot be reconciled. Just as long as security is measured in terms of available force, there can be no equality between nations. Equals share obligations and risks as well as rights and privileges. The difficulty was not solved, but the emergency was met by Germany walking out of the conference on October 13, 1933, and resigning from the League of Nations. This ended any hope that the conference might accomplish any worthwhile results. It continued for some months longer, held together largely by the tenacity of the President, Arthur Henderson, and the faithful services of such men as Benes of Czechoslovakia, de Madariaga of Spain, and Politis of Greece. No treaty was produced and

[2] Press Release of the Department of State, U. S. A., May 27, 1933.

no worthwhile agreements made binding upon the nations. The conference has never adjourned. The Business Committee, with Mr. Politis, its Vice-Chairman, serving as Chairman since the lamented death of Mr. Henderson, and Dr. Benes still serving as Reporteur; has an office in Geneva and issues statements and reports from time to time.

In the troubled state of affairs throughout the world and the present uncertainty in Europe, it is not likely that the conference will ever again take up its task, but if there were born a new will to disarm and the nations wanted to use this instrument, it stands ready to serve.

Where does all of this lead us? It is as clear as the light of day that the Disarmament Conference did not fail because it was too idealistic. Anyone who sat through months of discussion and closely followed, as I did, all of the various proposals and talked over with well-informed leaders the points at issue must agree that what broke down the conference was that every bold and courageous statement was met by the cynical answer, "Let's be realistic." The representatives of the nations, gathered in Geneva to find a means of reducing the crushing burden of arms laid upon the shoulders of mankind, ended by saying, because of fear, doubt and distrust, we can do nothing.

We shall consider at another place the present debacle of democratic government throughout the

world and trace the rise of Communism on the one hand and Fascism on the other. In trying to assess the true value of these movements, we must give full place to the fact that nearly every government decides its most fundamental issues not according to justice and righteousness but according to expediency. A responsible statesman who would say in a public speech, "My nation feels that it *ought* to follow this course of action" would be put down as a dreamer. William Jennings Bryan talked that way when he was Secretary of State and everyone said: "He has missed his calling; he should be pastor of a church." MacDonald, as Prime Minister of the first Labor Government in England, was accused of "thinking you can run the British Empire on the principles of the Lord's Prayer." The usual formula hailed as realistic is the statement of Stephen Decatur: "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong." Suppose the nations tried the Golden Rule. Suppose they put ought instead of must in their vocabulary of diplomacy. The realist replies: "Come now, do you think that will work?" To which we reply: "It will probably work as well as the old diplomacy which, based on national prestige, national honor so-called, emulation, pride, a demand for a place in the sun, fear, distrust, greed and selfishness, has led our world to the very verge of ruin and in the midst of world-

wide confusion and disorder is piling up arms and armaments and squandering ruthlessly the people's money in preparation for a greater and more disastrous war. The wildest, most fanatical idealism could hardly have made a worse mess of affairs."

CHAPTER SIX

BUILDING THE WORLD COMMUNITY

WORLD peace can be attained and made permanent only through world organization. The League of Nations is the nearest approach to such an organization, but as yet this agency has not found itself. It is a beginning, but it is kept on the periphery instead of being made the center of world interests. The nations come to Geneva to adjust differences and talk over grievances, but the most important issues of foreign policy are determined by the various governments in their national capitals. These decisions, having once been taken, are not easily changed. In the discussion of every serious question the opinion is not that of members of a community but of representatives officially speaking for Rome, Berlin, Moscow, Paris or London. It was amusing and became almost ludicrous to watch Baron Aloisi as he tried to fill the difficult position of Italy's spokesman before the League in 1935 when his country was on trial as a covenant breaker and aggressor against Ethiopia. He was constantly in telephonic communication with Rome. No matter how simple the issue, before he voted

he "talked with Mussolini and got his instructions." It goes without saying that no world organization can become a super-state and as such take absolute authority in settling international disputes. The nations must, however, be willing to give the League more power than it has been able to exercise up to the present.

To be realistic we must recognize that the League has failed. Not wholly failed and not finally failed, but for the moment it is powerless to vitally affect any important decisions. Manchuria, Ethiopia, Danzig, and the general attitude of Hitler, together with the seething cauldron of troubles in Spain, mark ineffectiveness and failure.

It may seem to some almost like bad manners, or at least bad judgment, for an American to discuss the failures of the League. I do not hold to this view. America is responsible for an initial weakness of the League structure. Her failure to cooperate or even to treat the League with due courtesy and consideration as a worthwhile institution working for human welfare and a better world all contributed to this victory of greed, aggression, and anarchy. The League alone during these years has been the emblem and agency for order and world peace. But the League at present cannot fulfill its destiny. It is only by considering the reasons that brought about its failure that we can learn how

to set about building a better and more efficient world community.

Why has the League failed? First of all the League was founded to end war and establish peace on a permanent basis among the nations. But it was created out of the hates and resentments of a long and bitter war. It was a device of the victors who excluded from it the vanquished. The defeated nations were branded as the chief enemies of peace in the future as they had been during the war. The treaty forced upon them was to become the law of civilized nations and the League was the instrument for carrying out its provisions. True, there was an element of idealism worked into the foundations of the League, but this was overlaid with a different set of notions. None of us who heard him in his great Metropolitan Opera House address in New York City can ever forget the impressive words of Woodrow Wilson as, with lifted finger for emphasis, he said:

> And men who, when I first went over there, were skeptical of the possibility of forming a league of nations, admitted that if we could but form it it would be an invaluable instrumentality through which to secure the operation of the various parts of the treaty; and when that treaty comes back gentlemen on this side will find the Covenant not only in it, but so many threads of the treaty tied to the Covenant that you cannot dissect the Covenant from the treaty without destroying the whole vital structure. The structure of peace will not

be vital without the League of Nations, and no man is going to bring back a cadaver with him.[1]

The League of Nations was a "League to Enforce Peace" and it could easily be interpreted, as Germany afterwards did interpret it, as being an organization to restrain and keep down the conquered nations. The League was the best thing that came out of the Paris Peace Conference and was the concrete expression of a real desire for a future peaceful world based on justice, but the war's aftermath of hate damned the League at its birth.

The covenant of the League includes too many promises and agreements that the nations signatory to it are unable to carry out. No one could foresee what would happen and no nation could give a signed blank check and be sure that it could pay the amount written in by a new agency when the check was finally presented. This proved true in relation to Japan as well as Italy. The nations were committed to definite action against these aggressors, but, as we will see in the next chapter when we discuss sanctions, a trade blockade against Japan meant the use of naval power and that would mean war in the Far East. Public opinion in neither France, America, nor England would support such a war. The nations who had covenanted with China to protect her territory could do nothing effective

[1] *War and Peace*, Vol. I, p. 451, The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson.

enough to stop Japan, and Japan, knowing it, defied the world. The League lost out just in proportion as its members failed to keep their pledged word. The same thing occurred in relation to Italy and Ethiopia. Here was a clear-cut case of aggression. The plight of Ethiopia is much worse than that of China. The taking of Manchuria was about the same as if a strong, predatory neighbor should steal a few hundred acres from a rich landowner whose actual home was located on the same property, but a thousand miles away.

The moral issue is the same, but it is not such a glaring case of cruelty joined to theft. Italy not only took Ethiopian territory but stole the home property, bombed and gassed the dwellers in their own homes, and, having turned them out, gave them and their future into alien hands. Sanctions were voted but the only real pressure that would have stopped Italy and saved Ethiopia was an agreement to cut off all oil supplies and close the Suez Canal. Italy defied the world and threatened war should these measures be adopted. The nations, in spite of their pledged word, were again unable to act. Public opinion would not support the League if its sanctions led to war. No wonder Mussolini, Hitler and the War Lords of Japan have little or no respect for the League and its efforts. Nations, like men, lose face when they fail to do what they agree to do. A world community to carry out its

purpose must be based on reality. Its fundamental commitments must not exceed its power of fulfillment.

It became apparent soon after its first few meetings that the League of Nations was becoming a League of Governments, not a League of the people. The record shows that on many occasions important decisions had to wait while a new government came into power in France. This also occurred at least twice in relation to Great Britain. The custom of appointing the Foreign Minister as chief of the national delegations became so common that in later years it was said that in September all the foreign offices in the various European countries moved to Geneva. The discussions centered chiefly around national policies. Almost every decision was determined outside the halls of the League by the Foreign Ministers of two or three of the chief nations agreeing upon a policy which they were then able to announce as the program of the League.

The withdrawal of the United States of America was a staggering blow which crippled the League even before it began to function. The League was the chief work of Woodrow Wilson. The plaque on the buildings housing the Secretariat commemorates Wilson as the League's founder. The principal avenue in "International Geneva" is the "Quai de Wilson." At the end of the war the United States was the most powerful nation in the world. Any

organization of the nations to be effective must be universal. With Russia excluded because of her communism, Germany because of her war record, and with America refusing membership, the League began its difficult task under an impossible handicap.

Too much attention has been given by the League to the matter of coercion and not enough to efforts to adjust differences "before they arise." The League has succeeded in adjusting a large number of difficult problems, but the tendency has been to put the emphasis upon the idea of force, "a League to enforce peace" instead of "a family or community of nations."

The League cannot be excused altogether from the suspicion of hypocrisy. This is particularly true of the mandate system as a means of settling the difficult colonial question. The mandated territories were never intended to be incorporated as an integral part of the national territory of the powers holding the mandates. But Japan's readiness to fight if her island mandates were taken away from her, and the nervousness evinced in the British Parliament when even the question of the return of some of the colonies to Germany is raised indicate that mandate means to these nations complete sovereignty over the territories awarded by the League.

Finally, the League developed a sort of formal professionalism. This was inevitable. No great institution can avoid this trend. Even those who dis-

pense charity set up a rule of thumb that must be followed and demand that only the "duly qualified and certified" are competent to meet the needs of starving people. I recently sat in with a group of men and women who called themselves "experts on youth." It was to be a Youth Conference. There were perhaps a dozen young men and women present, but of the "experts" one could easily doubt whether they had ever been young. With the passing of time international issues settled outside of the League framework were likely to be viewed in the light of "successes that weakened the League's authority." Many of the chief friends of the League were bitterly opposed to the Briand-Kellogg Pact —not on the grounds that "war can never be outlawed simply by the nations signing a treaty," but on the ground that the Briand-Kellogg Pact sets up an opposition group to the League.

The League, like the Church, thinks too much of itself as a perfect institution and not enough as an experiment station. Whenever a success was registered by the League it was claimed as a proof of the soundness of the "League method." When on the other hand the League failed, as it did in South America, Japan and Ethiopia, the outside world pointed to these failures as failures of the League itself. As a matter of fact, no human institution is perfect. The Church at its best is an experiment station where individuals are seeking to-

gether for better lives through the development of moral character. The League is an experiment station where the nations are seeking together for a better mode of life. Their task is to build up a formal and authoritative community of world interests.

The catalogue of the weaknesses of the League indicates the changes that are essential but gives no ground for the cynical remark of an American journalist who when asked if he didn't think the League was dead replied: "It was never alive." The idea on which the League is founded is as sound as ever. When engineers first attempted to build a stretch of highway through a western range of the Rocky Mountains they found themselves faced with enormous technical and operating difficulties. These they overcame and at last the highway was opened for traffic. The first winter was marked by extraordinarily heavy snowfalls. The drifts were higher than had ever been known. The engineers, when they figured on averages of half a century, felt secure in building to withstand that pressure, plus about fifty per cent. But the highway collapsed and was a failure for a short time. The road was needed and as soon as spring cleared away the snow, the hard work of rebuilding began. Again the engineers made their estimates, but this time they figured on a heavier strain to be carried and increased the margin of safety by one hundred per

cent. They built so solidly and surely that today a broad highway carries the traffic across the continental divide. When a man's house burns he does not say: "I knew it was no good; if we build another it will probably be destroyed also. So for the future myself and family will live out of doors or in a cave." When the earthquake destroyed the chief cities of Japan some scientists said that owing to the volcanic structure of the island no city could be built that would withstand these frequent and often very heavy earthquakes. But the builders of Japan set to work almost before the earth had quit trembling and Tokio is a finer and better city than ever. "Anything that is worth doing, is worth doing well," and can be done well.

The building up of a community is a slow business. Its authority extends itself by almost imperceptible degrees. Houses, stores, paved streets and sidewalks do not constitute a community. Years ago a group of California promoters built a model town in a beautiful valley. The central square was dominated by a City Hall built of matched granite, and around it were blocks of stores and offices. The streets were all paved, the sidewalks in perfect order. A water and sewage system was provided. The homes were constructed, like the public buildings, all of granite. It was an ideal little city and when completed it lacked only one thing to make it perfect, and that one thing was enough people

to make the prebuilt town a community of human beings. The city where I lived as a boy was only a few miles distant and I have often camped amid the splendors of this deserted city that never was occupied except by the builders and a caretaker or two. The model city was a costly setting without a jewel; a body without a soul.

At the other extreme we have the stories of many Utopian communities that have been built, flourished for a while and then failed. Every one of them failed because in the spiritual realm they made the same mistakes as the promoters who built a city of stone before they had created a city of souls. Brook Farm, New Harmony, New Utopia, and numerous others all failed because they began with too perfect an organization. They promised too much and pledged their citizens to too much. At first, under the enthusiasm of a new idea, it seemed reasonable to take the necessary pledges and assume the obligations of living in perfect harmony. But as the days grew into weeks and months the hard experiences wore away the shining silver plates of idealism and revealed the unattractive brass of desire and selfishness underneath. No one was to blame. It was simply that groups of human beings had bargained for more than they could deliver. "The spirit was willing but the flesh was weak."

The public knows but little about the actual operation of the League of Nations. The political

discussions are reported all over the world. The attempts to settle quarrels are so spectacular that they absorb the public interest to the exclusion of anything else. These interests, important as they are, make up only a small part of the activities of the League. The new League buildings, together with the International Labor Office and the World Court at The Hague, house a permanent personnel of about 1250, made up of secretaries, stenographers, clerks, and other officials and workers. A list of the commissions and tasks upon which this large force of workers is employed is an impressive one. Pittman Potter points out in a careful study of the League and its work these facts. He says: "The Preamble to the Covenant of the League of Nations declares the purposes of the League to be, in the order named, the promotion of international cooperation and the achievement of international peace and security. In actual fact it was recognized from the beginning that the League would have two distinct tasks to perform. These may be described tentatively as the maintenance of peace and security on one hand and the development of international cooperation on the other. It is interesting to note that of these, the latter was placed first in the statement in the Preamble."[2]

The League, with skill and efficiency, is dealing

[2] *The Social Services of the League of Nations*—Geneva Special Studies, Vol. VI, No. 9, 1935.—Geneva Research Center.

with the important questions of health, economics and finance, communications and transit, railways, steamships, post offices, telephones, telegraph, radios, cables, and many other similar issues; opium, prostitution and child welfare. The services of the League in research, information, and intellectual cooperation are manifold. The International Labor Office brings together for the first time representatives of labor, of capital, their unions and organizations, to deal effectively and intelligently on a worldwide basis with all the problems connected with labor and industry, such as wages, hours, etc. The League has promoted extensive relief projects as direct enterprises and has aided extra League agencies in this work. The record shows a vast amount of work, all of which is not only important but represents the *most important* things the League is doing. In these efforts the League is dealing with the fundamental adjustments demanded by our new international civilization. Every human problem is today worldwide in its implications. Wrongs can be righted and just relations between man and man and between human beings and the society of which they are component parts be made secure only as justice and righteousness are considered from a universal standpoint. This is the supreme task of the League. Peace, much as it is desired, is after all not wholly an end in itself. Peace depends upon the establishment of right relations and

a series of infinitely delicate adjustments that can be worked out only by hard, persistent toil. Permanent peace is a chain with all the links of equal strength, rather than a solid structure. The League is steadily and persistently hammering out the links in this chain which will gradually bind the whole world into a real unity. The League has not failed and is not failing in these things.

We do not often give it much thought, but it is a fact that coercion plays a very small part in the life of our community. The average person lives his daily life unconscious of the existence of police officers. We see these men with their blue uniforms; we pass dozens of them on the streets of our city in the course of every day, but how many policemen do you know personally. How many times have you been warned by the police for breaking some law? Have you ever been arrested? How many people in the course of your life have you seen arrested? Only a few. The great mass of our people are unconscious of the fact that we live under a system of government supported by force. It is true nevertheless. You and I are always under the observation and protection of the policeman. He is a part of and essential to the maintenance of community life. But the exercise of this force is rarely used. The reason for this is that we all, working together, have created a community spirit that stands back of the policeman. For the privilege of

living in an orderly community we willingly limit our freedom and accept a curtailment of our most fundamental rights. Take, for instance, the laws prohibiting picking flowers in the public parks, or another type of law which limits the speed of automobiles. Most of us submit to these restrictions. If we all picked the flowers in the park, there would be no flowers for anyone to pick. If no one respected the red lights and all insisted on driving at any speed desired, we would have chaos and smashups so that no one could drive at any speed. Suppose a person says: "I have paid for my automobile. It is a good car and a high-powered car. Why should I drive it at fifteen or twenty miles when it can make eighty miles an hour?" The answer is: "All right, you can drive eighty miles an hour, but not in the city. Take your car out into the desert where you are alone and drive as fast as you please." The joker in this advice is that in the desert there are no paved streets or roads and a high-powered automobile is useless. Therefore, the car owner must exchange some of his rights for the privilege of using the highways provided for him by the community. Most people submit cheerfully and feel that they have made a good bargain. A few rebel and it is against these that the community enforces its sanctions.

Our community with its peace and its law and order is not the growth of a few years but of long

and patient experimentation. The schools, churches, and homes have set the ideal and taught the right spirit. Business and finance have buttressed this spirit with ample proof that even from the lowest point of view, that of private gain, the orderly community is superior to the best pioneer settlement. You can make more money, secure more happiness, and rest assured of better conditions just in proportion as you do your part in building up and supporting your community. It was with the dawning of this idea that the service clubs found their reason for being. The Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, and other civic organizations of a like nature are constantly preaching and urging the value of community cooperation and the development of a more powerful community spirit.

The world community must follow the same lines of growth. It is more difficult, as we have pointed out, to deal with nations than with individuals. But we must learn the method and follow it with zeal. The whole trend of our times is toward a larger concept of man. He is not an isolated unit. He must be considered in relation to all his commitments. He is a member of the family, of the group, of the trade, commerce, or professional union. He is a member of a lodge, of a church, of a nation. More and more we realize that these relationships are what make or mar the individual. He cannot get away from them and their influence any more

than he can escape his own shadow. The best he can do is to change relationships. Here he has a limited choice. Finding that one group with which he is bound up is having a bad influence upon his mental, moral and economic outlook, he may give up that association, but it is only to transfer immediately his loyalty to a new group. Every person is influenced by his associations and at the same time he influences the groups of which he is a member.

The chief task of the League is to bring the nations into close harmony with each other and to keep them working together to better the position of each and so improve conditions throughout the world. The adjustments that are necessary should center about this one ideal. The community secures the loyalty of its citizens by appealing to what may be described as their higher selfish interests and proving that these interests can be increased and conserved only through the betterment of those conditions that are common to all. This is the basic meaning of the word community, that is, common good. The finest word to describe a nation is the word commonwealth, which means wealth that belongs to all—things for which all are responsible and in which all may take equal pride. The League of Nations must become the Commonwealth of the nations themselves.

The Briand-Kellogg Pact might well be taken as the starting point in developing a reconstructed

League. Let the obligations assumed in this treaty cover and take the place of Articles X, XI, XII, XV, XVI, and XVII of the present covenant. These are the articles that bind the nations to take certain very definite steps providing any nation breaks its pledged word. "Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League." This being true, every nation is pledged to cooperate in whatever measures are decided upon, even to the extent of the use of military and naval force. This pledge might be carried out if the nations were all absolute monarchies. But with the spread of popular education, the governments in democratic countries cannot make war or even use armed force without the consent of the people themselves. Mussolini and Hitler can make war because for the present at least the German and Italian people have given up the right and privilege of thinking for themselves. In Berlin and Rome an independent thinker is as popular as a turkey at a grasshoppers' convention. This is not true in other lands. However logical any plan of collective security may be, it will not work as a practical measure beyond the range of a people's vital and immediate needs. The French and Belgian people feel the force of any appeal for aid against Germany on the Rhine, but are cold to a proposal of war against Italy for

the protection of Ethiopia. On the other hand, England's interests in the Mediterranean and the necessity for keeping her trade route to India open gave her a vital interest in Ethiopia. These were the reasons that brought about the fundamental dissensions in the League's efforts to apply sanctions against Italy. Great Britain was not afraid of war with Italy, but was afraid of popular opinion in England if a war with Italy should start a general war. It was this uncertainty that led to hesitation, and hesitation meant failure. If the nations had had no prior commitments beyond the obligation to meet and discuss together the situation and out of the conference agree upon some concerted action, it is wholly possible that a much wider and more complete cooperation could have been secured.

Some such paragraph as the following might sum up the obligations the nations would be required to assume toward a covenant breaker. This obligation would then become the basis of membership in the League.

Should any serious dispute arise between two or more nations in any part of the world, likely to lead to a rupture of good relations, the nation members of the League agree to meet at once to consult on ways and means of settling the dispute by peaceful measures.

This would leave the League free to carry on its helpful service in removing the causes and lessen-

ing the dangers of war. It would also give the nations freedom to work out plans and methods for dealing with a wrongdoer, even to the extent of using military and naval force if necessary, but without any prior commitments.

Chapter Seven

REALISTIC SANCTIONS

Calvin Coolidge was made President of the United States by the striking policemen in the city of Boston.

Mob violence, which chiefly took the form of window smashing, was in evidence in scattered sections of the city within a few hours after the union members of the police force went out on strike. Free from the restraints of the law, hundreds of young gangsters and hoodlums in a few districts proceeded at once to break windows, loot stores and cause disorder. A wave of public indignation beat against the City Hall and State House following these excesses, when the city virtually was abandoned to hoodlums, among whom was a large faction of the criminal class. The newspapers of September 11, 1919, said:

> While Mayor Peters was engaged with efforts to resolve the strike itself, Governor Calvin Coolidge this afternoon assumed complete charge of the situation, so far as preserving order goes. It is to Governor Coolidge that the Police Commissioner is directly responsible.

In a telegram to Samuel Gompers, then President

of the American Federation of Labor, the Governor expressed his determination to "defend the sovereignty of Massachusetts" and said that Gompers' charge that Police Commissioner Curtis was wrong did not justify the wrong of leaving the city of Boston at the mercy of all the criminal elements. Messages approving the Governor's stand arrived at the State House from every part of the United States.

As was said in another place, the average citizen is not aware of the existence of the police, but as soon as they are withdrawn violence breaks out. Boston is no worse than any other large city. What happened there illustrates fully how dependent we are on force to restrain the evildoers. There is an old fable of a truce once proposed between the animals. They all agreed to meet in a pleasant valley and hold a carnival. The cat and the mouse, the lion and the lamb, the wolf and the sheep, the dog and the fox, the eagle and the duck, the hawk and the wren were all to meet together in good fellowship and love. An old fox refused to go. Urged to join them by a group of hounds on their way to the valley, he shook his head: "No, I have heard about the truce, and I know that all the other beasts have taken the pledge, but there is sure to be some hound that will forget."

Every effort to create a community is hindered and slowed up by those who forget. Paul said, in

writing to the Romans: "The powers that be are ordained of God." Some of us may well doubt the soundness of this statement, but he goes on to say that government is ordained of God to restrain the ones that do evil, "for rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." He then shows how the right-minded people, through their cooperative action, can create the higher restraints to take the place of the lower. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." (Romans 13:1-10)

The Roman world was a community held together by military power. Behind the good-natured tolerance of all religions was a force that demanded a higher allegiance to the Roman standards. Rome made laws, was just in carrying them out, but these laws had for their sanction every ounce of strength of the whole Empire. With the coming of Christianity arose a new set of problems that Rome had to face. Here was a "way of life" contrary to the Roman ideal. Here was a religion which set up a new authority. It was leaven working unseen in an amazingly short time in every part of the vast Empire. Jesus of Nazareth dared Rome to a new experiment.

Surrounded by the resistless might of Imperial Rome He dared to believe that His Kingdom of love should some day conquer; and that in the long run, right would

supplant might, and love overcome hate. He told men that His cross should be a mightier force than the Roman eagles, and that the Roman Mars should some day bow before the power of His peace.[1]

The hundreds of thousands of orderly local communities throughout the world, where police force is subordinated to a higher rule, prove both the truth of these claims and the value of every attempt to make them universal.

The ideal of the local community is the ideal of the world community. If individuals can be dominated by unselfish motives and ultimately find that unselfish action pays better than selfishness, nations, acting together, can do the same. However, we cannot be unmindful of the fact that it is always much easier to deal with individuals than with groups of individuals. No matter how perfect the world organization may be, or how strongly buttressed the pledges which make up its structure, there will always be nations and groups within nations working against the common good. These nations are the gangsters in the world community. They seek their own interests at the expense of others by the use of coercive measures which they themselves provide. Some method must be devised by which the evil workers can be controlled. Moral suasion alone is not a very effective weapon against armed bandits. Something else is needed.

[1] *The Great Galilean Returns,* Henry K. Booth, p. 19, Scribner's.

The processes of education and salvation will progressively lessen this need, but it will be a long time before force can be eliminated from our social and international organizations. It is theoretically true that no nation can be justly called a *criminal* nation, but actually when the government of a people falls into the hands of ill-disposed, selfish, vain and ambitious men without moral idealism, whole nations become a definite menace to the peace and welfare of the rest of the world. In building up the world community we must take into consideration the fact that from time to time some nation will become such a menace. Then we are faced with the question: what shall we do?

The League of Nations provided for such a contingency. In case of war or a threat of war the nations agreed to take certain actions against the aggressor State. The measures to be taken are known as sanctions. This word, although in common use today, is new among English-speaking people and is really the definition of security. The word developed in French thought and refers to the means used to punish the violation and to assure the execution of an agreement, a contract or a law. It is defined by the English writers as "that which induces the observance of law or custom." In ethics a sanction is any influence, such as pleasure, pain or the sense of duty which leads to moral action. To *enforce* obedience is after all the basic meaning of

a sanction. It refers primarily to those means adopted in international law to enforce legal decisions. Under the old system in vogue before the war, security was sought through military alliances. Since the war the attempt has been made to reach this result through common agreements among a greater or smaller number of States to act together when the established rights of one of them have been violated by force. Security is therefore guaranteed by the pledged sanctions to be taken against the wrongdoer. You will note in this definition the use of the phrase "established rights." This means that no nation can judge its own case; that rights must be determined by all the nations acting together. Any nation refusing to submit its case to the judgment of its associates in the society of nations at once puts itself in the wrong; and just as Japan, and a few days later Peru, were declared in default, all the nations are by the logic of the situation compelled to maintain a unity and solidarity against them.

Can peace be enforced? Two schools of thought were represented among those who formulated the covenant. One insisted that the only way to maintain peace is by enforcing with armies and navies the decisions arrived at by the nations in conference. The aggressor must be coerced into accepting the judgment of the nations. True, there was a difference of opinion as to how it should be ap-

plied, but in the thought of those who were most prominent and influential the force necessary involved the combined military and naval forces of all the nations.

The other school of thought believed that the use of any armed force in an attempt to bring about peace is an anomaly; that peace cannot be secured at the end of a bayonet. They did agree, however, that there were certain sanctions, peaceful in their very nature, that could be utilized. They had in mind such sanctions as non-intercourse with a nation that has defaulted in its pledges, non-recognition of territory gained by aggression, a refusal to sell arms or make it possible for the aggressor to carry on a war, a refusal to extend credit, the withdrawal of ambassadors, ministers and consuls. In other words, they proposed to treat the defaulting nation just as a community treats an individual who transgresses the moral code. He is ostracized by his fellows, is excluded from the best circles of society. No one will employ him or give him support. No one cares to have any dealings with him. He may not be brought into court, he may not be condemned to prison and certainly not to execution, but the community leaves him alone. He is a marked man; he lives without friends and without fellowship.

This is the strongest possible sanction. In civil life most people obey the law not out of fear of

the police or prison, but because they value the place, power, respect, and dignity afforded them by the community when they conform to its accepted rules of conduct. What is true of the individual is true of a nation, for it values its word, its place and its dignity, and is kept in a course of right dealing in order to preserve those precious gifts received from association in the community of nations. No nation is strong enough to live under the stigma of the transgressor, and no nation can make successful war contrary to the moral judgments of mankind.[2]

The conflict in the Far East and the failure to restrain Italy in Ethiopia demonstrate the inadequacy of existing engagements and machinery for maintaining peace and safeguarding the interests of the world community. Something more is needed. But before that something can be provided, we must consider what has been done and draw our conclusions as a basis for a more permanent structure. It is clear, I think, that no sanction, however simple, can be applied to any great nation that does not involve the ultimate use of force if it is to be effective. The sanctions enumerated in the covenant of the League are graduated —the declaration by vote that a nation is an aggressor is to be followed by economic and financial

[2] For a more complete discussion of this question see No. 12, International Peace Series, published by Church Peace Union, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

pressure, diplomatic measures, and, as a final means, military and naval coercion. The first step is purely a moral gesture. The nation is declared a criminal and an outlaw, although we have no definition of the status of an outlawed nation. Neither Japan nor Italy was greatly embarrassed by being put under moral obloquy by vote of the League.

In the case of Japan the League went no further in an attempt to punish the lawbreaker. Japan on her side went steadily ahead with her aggression and added thousands of square miles to the areas already plundered from China. If the nations had taken the next step and declared an embargo against Japan in order to enforce it, they would have had to send a huge naval force to the Far East. Thus the second step would have been naval coercion. With the riches of China at her door and isolated by distance, as well as a very formidable naval and military defense system, the coercion of Japan would have meant war, and no nation was prepared to take the risk.

With Italy the position was different, but the fundamental facts were the same. The League not only voted her an aggressor and made her an outlaw, but fifty-two nations out of fifty-six in the League voted to apply economic sanctions against her. Trade was cut off and the nations agreed to loan her no money. Her commerce and economic life were crippled. Her gold flowed out from her treas-

ury like water. The British fleet stood guard in the Mediterranean and although there was no blockade of her ports, the British Government entered into a treaty of mutual assistance with the chief Mediterranean powers, while the committee of the League having the matter in hand progressively increased the list of contraband goods. Finally everything was included except oil—and oil was the one article without which Italy would be helpless. Paul Morand, the eminent French writer, tells of a trip he took through the Red Sea last winter and noted that oil vessels were so busily engaged in bringing oil and gasoline to the Italian ports for use against Ethiopia that "the Suez Canal was crowded and a long line waited to enter while the distant horizon of the Red Sea was filled with others."[3] There were tankers from all the great oil producing countries; Standard, Shell, Asiatic Petroleum, Burmah Oil, Mantacheff, Vacuum Oil, Steana Romana, Deutsche Petroleum, Anglo-Persian, Texas Co. and others. It was "good business" not to shut down on oil. But that was not the deciding reason. Italy knew that if these lines of oil transport were stopped she would be unable to continue her war on Ethiopia and at the same time would be "caught out" and unable to get back home. So she defied the world. She rushed troops into Libya along the Egyptian border and threat-

[3] See *La Route des Indes*, Paul Morand, Librarie Plon, Paris.

ened to start a world war if her supplies of oil were cut off. None of the great nations was prepared to take the risk and while they hesitated Italy, with gasoline propelled airplanes, continued her aggression against a helpless people and gassed out of existence a nation with whom she had covenanted in the League, to protect from "all external aggression."

It forms an ugly incident in international affairs and puts a black page in the history of the modern world. The nations will never have an easier case to deal with than this one. There will never be another situation where such effective sanctions could be quickly applied. Had the League voted to "cut off all oil supplies, all financial credit, and to prohibit the passage of troops on an illegal mission through the Suez Canal," the war with Ethiopia would never have begun. The rest of the world could get along for a long time without Italian spaghetti and Parmesan cheese, but Mussolini could not have lasted a month without oil or credit, and with the canal closed. The alternatives to the application of such sanctions were to allow Italy to sacrifice Ethiopia, or an European war. The nations accepted the former as the lesser of two evils.

At this point we must underline one fact that is as clear as daylight. *As long as the nations are heavily armed and prepared for war, any effective sanction voted by the world community of nations, if en-*

forced, will lead to war. A speaker in Geneva said before a luncheon meeting during the time that the League was discussing the case of Italy and Ethiopia:

> The voting of sanctions is nothing unless they are enforced. If they are enforced the methods employed will look like war, will smell like war, and by the Eternal it will be war.

He was right, and until the nations, acting together, get some agreement whereby all weapons of aggression will be destroyed and the means of national defense reduced, and effectively reduced, no sanction can be enforced without threat and imminent danger of war. Sanctions are not war, but in the presence of a world armed for war they can be looked at as nothing short of war measures. President Wilson in his first draft of a covenant for the League recognized this fact and stated it as the second requirement for maintaining peace and dealing with an aggressor. His first two suggestions were:

(1) A potentially universal League.
(2) All-around reduction and limitation of armaments.

When the covenant was finally completed, these two items stood exactly in this relation to the whole concept and structure of the League. A further pledge to disarm clarified and justified the action in disarming Germany, who was considered at that particular moment the most likely disturber of

peace. "The disarmament of Germany is a first step to general disarmament."

In his speech on September 11, 1935, before the Assembly of the League, Sir Samuel Hoare stated the same principle in these words:

> The two principal conditions in which the system of collective security is designed to operate are first, that the members of the League should have reduced their armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.[4]

He then goes on to outline the necessity of providing the means for "the modification by consent and by peaceful means of international conditions whose continuance might be a danger to peace."

The only sure way to stop a war is to stop it before it begins. This can be done only by removing those fundamental evils which are so irksome to a people that they will gladly and enthusiastically support a war if no other method is found to ease off the hurt. Until some more just and equitable distribution is made of the products and resources of the earth, and all the nations are given freer access to these supplies which are essential to modern life, no permanent peace can be established among nations. "Man does not live by bread alone," but no nation can and will exist without provision

[4] Speech of Sir Samuel Hoare, Sept. 11. Record of League Assembly, 1935.

for the basic needs of its people. This is not merely an economic but also a profoundly religious question. As matters now stand, the world is divided into two groups of nations—those who have more than they can use, and those who have less than they need. The necessity for adjustment is urgent and is deeply felt. To quote Sir Samuel Hoare again, who spoke not as an individual but as the Foreign Secretary of the British Empire:

> It is not enough to insist collectively that war shall not occur, or that war if it does occur shall be brought to an end. Something must also be done to remove the causes from which war is apt to arise. The British Government for its part would be willing to participate in an investigation as to how far a freer distribution of raw materials could best be guaranteed.

This means that all the nations must be willing to cooperate in consideration of all the questions relating to colonies, mandates, zones of influence, tariffs, free trade, economic barriers to the free flow of commerce, and other restraints and politico-economic checks to trade. But the problem has even deeper roots. The French thesis has been that the peace of Europe, and so of the world, depends upon the maintenance of the status quo. The treaties at the end of the war set the boundaries of the various states and defined rights, privileges and obligations. These treaties have become the framework within which any adjustments must be made.

This concept is diametrically opposed to any helpful adjustments even in the structure of the League itself. It is apparent that a large and growing element of French public opinion is opposed to this older concept of what has been aptly called "static justice." When Hitler marched his troops into the Rhineland he tore to shreds all that remained of the Treaty of Versailles, and with that action the Locarno Pacts lost their meaning. Andre Tardieu, writing in "Gringoire" (August 7, 1936), says:

> Locarno is so dead that one does not speak now of anything except its replacement. This is what France, Belgium and England talked about in London on July 24. In order to facilitate the funerals of the treaties they have modestly called "*le coup de force hitlerien le initiative Allemand*."

Germany is rearming; Italy proclaims herself as "satisfied"; and together they have worked out an agreement with Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria whereby they assume a new hegemony of Europe.

Provision for revision of treaties and the peaceful adjustment of grievances will not satisfy all demands. There will always be problems complicated by the ill will and selfish overreaching of some nation or nations. There will always be the necessity for the use of coercive action, but with approximate justice for all and adequate means for considering complaints, the force of moral public opinion will gradually win over the recalcitrant

few and will support just measures against those who cannot be so won over.

The world community depends for its strength upon the cooperation of the great powers. These nations are so inhibited by their own strength and prestige that their statesmen find it very difficult to do the things that they know should and could be done. The smaller nations find it much easier to act. In the negotiations and discussions relating to Italy's breach of her covenant the smaller nations spoke with the most emphasis. But it was only France, England, Russia and Germany that really counted. What these nations said, did, or might do, determined the course of the controversy. All the small nations acting together could not influence the situation as much as one of the great powers.

It soon became evident that the divergence of opinion between France and England would wreck the efforts of the League for a settlement. As Paul Morand has pointed out, the interest of England in Ethiopia was not purely humanitarian. Her strong stand was for the protection of "the route to India," and for Lake Tana, controlling the headwaters of the Blue Nile. The future of the Soudan and much of Egypt was bound up in the decisions to be taken at Geneva. On the other hand, France had deep political reasons that drove her ahead in her dealings with Italy. Relations between these

two nations have been long under heavy strain. Their interests are similar in the Mediterranean. England has so completely dominated this inland ocean that Italy and France have really felt that they have only permissive rights there. After the war France gained new colonies in Africa and her position in the Mediterranean was greatly strengthened. Italy also added to her territory, but did not get nearly as much as she had bargained for and so felt herself aggrieved. Under Mussolini the nation has become really a first-class power. Its shipping covers the seven seas and her industries at home and commerce abroad entitle her to a much larger place in international affairs than she occupies. By joining forces, Italy and France can deal more effectively with Great Britain. Laval saw this and his visit to Rome early in 1935 resulted in some agreement with Mussolini, the exact terms of which are not known.

Hitler took courage from the new developments and announced a naval building program. France became alarmed, for there seemed to be danger of Great Britain and Germany coming to an understanding. Italy is not famous for keeping her alliances and after all the real menace to French security is on the Rhine, not in the Mediterranean. So French opinion wavered. Finally France threw in her lot with the other nations and allied herself against Italy. Then came the unfortunate Hoare-

Laval proposal by which Ethiopia was to be sacrificed to the political exigencies of the great powers. Public opinion throughout the world was outraged. The storm of fury reached such heights in France and England that Laval and Hoare were both driven from office. Public opinion vindicated the League and prevented a complete and disgraceful retreat, but it did not save Ethiopia.

The discussion thus far indicates the difficulty in which the idealist and the realist each finds himself. The one is certain that peace cannot be enforced. The triumph of Italy against the massed force of a majority of the nations proves his contention. The other points to Japan as an example of the helplessness of public opinion to control an evil-intentioned nation. Moral indignation is futile except as it is backed by armed force. Both points of view are tenable and can be amply documented. The truth, however, lies not in an absolute but in a mediating position. There must be found a middle course. The world community must have at its command a force that will demand respect. Just as in our local community, we must have in the world community a code of laws to govern the nations. When a law is put on the statute books it becomes the duty of every citizen to respect it. He is at liberty to question it, and may use every legitimate means to have it repealed, but while it is the law it is his duty to obey it.

Many laws, however, have been passed by city, state and national governing bodies which could not be enforced. There are scores of laws on our statute books that none of us obey. Many of them are so out of date that they mean nothing today. We do not even know that we are breaking the law when we do many things that are customary. For instance, buying and selling on Sunday is illegal in most of our American states and at the same time the sale of Sunday papers exceeds that of any other day in the week. Laws are enforced only under certain conditions, and these conditions apply to the society of nations as well as to the society of individuals. These conditions are:

(1) A law to be enforced must appeal to a majority as a just law.
(2) It must be a law that can be enforced.
(3) Punishment for failure to obey the law must be graduated. The "punishment must fit the crime."
(4) The punishment must be sure.

One reason for the present excessive crime record in the United States is due to the fact that public opinion does not support the death penalty and the worst criminals figure that, in their own parlance, they "can beat the rap."

(5) The law must be impartially administered. The figure of Justice holding the scales and sword is represented as blindfolded.
(6) The punishment must follow speedily the infraction of the law.

The police and courts must function quickly. By the time the League held its meeting, voted its condemnation, and agreed upon sanctions, Italy had made long progress in preparing her war in Ethiopia. Then there was further delay before the forces of the League could be brought into action. Because of this "time lag" as it is called, Italy was able to beat her executioners and achieved her goal.

Another important point that every realistically minded person must consider is that no law remains in operation except as it appeals to a kind of higher selfishness on the part of the individual citizen. "Honesty is the best policy." Most of us will agree with the absolutist contention that this proverb puts honesty on a low plane when it is considered as a mere policy. Honesty is best because of its inherent goodness. Nevertheless it is good policy to be honest. Better be honest because it pays rather than be dishonest because you are not good enough to feel honest. No nation wants war but some are not willing to pay the price for peace. The community of nations must be constituted so that each nation will find it more to its advantage to remain at peace within the world structure than to live outside, an outcast and an outlaw. We learn to live at peace by experiments in living together. Our police forces are organized on the basis of our needs. Every suggestion that has been made up to the present for the constitution of an international

police force is open to serious objection. For a complete discussion of this question we are indebted to Lord Davies. He and his associates in the New Commonwealth Society are issuing from time to time vital studies and supporting with deep conviction the proposal that a great worldwide police system be established and given authority to coerce the law-breaking nations by the overwhelming power of its weapons. General Fuller, writing for the Society, says:

> War will be eliminated by weapons, not by words or treaties or leagues of nations: by weapons which will render opposition hopeless or retribution so terrible that nations will think not once or twice but many times before going to war.[5]

These proposals are not new or revolutionary. They are as old as the plea for adequate preparedness for war in times of peace. No aggregation of force can be so great as to permanently overawe the world. Any given combination of powers will be matched by other combinations. General Fuller's thesis is the same as that which led to the World War. Such combination of weapons is not a genuine police force.

Another proposal is that the world be divided

[5] *An International Air Force*, The New Commonwealth, Mowbray House, Norfolk St., London. *Suicide or Sanity*, The New Commonwealth, Mowbray House, Norfolk St., London. *The Problem of the 20th Century*, Lord Davies, published by Ernest Benn, Ltd., London.

into zones and by international agreement the great nations be allotted regional spheres of responsibility. Under this plan there would be created a European bloc charged with the task of maintaining peace on the European continent. The Americas would be put under another zonal arrangement, Asia, Africa, the Far East and the Middle East. The difficulty here is twofold. First, it breaks down the idea which must be central in any effective world police system; that is, it must be unified and universal. The centers of these various zones of influence and power would very quickly become rivals for a control of the world. Secondly, with the rapid development of science and the increased ease and facility of intercourse between the nations, we are all becoming more and more dependent upon each other. This world is not a very big planet, and it is growing smaller as man expands his own means of compassing the earth, the air and now the stratosphere.

We must have some effective world police. The cross-roads are dangerous and the high speed of modern civilization constantly increases the risks. We must have adequate controls and effective checks on unrestrained national selfishness. These checks and constraints must be based on actual needs and freed, as far as possible, from the control of the old military and naval type of mind. There can be no effective police force without a world community to protect, and no world community

can exist without an adequate police force. One cannot be created at the expense of the other or apart from the other. Both must be, as we have shown, created together.

As the community develops a new idealism and furnishes a new set of moral principles, it will become the property of all the nations. The world will thus become a new commonwealth of which the nations are the citizens and the participators in its good. Then the use of force will fall to its proper level and will be, in the words of Paul, "an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil."

CHAPTER EIGHT

ACCESS TO RAW MATERIALS

WE READ "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," but few of us believe it. The earth belongs to the strong, to the heavily armed, the ruthless; those who can and do take it and hold it against all contenders. In this process of grabbing, nearly all the available resources of the earth have come into the hands of a few nations. These we call great nations because of what they have and because they are able to hang on to their possessions. Other nations want to be great also, they want some of the good land, harbors and coast lines that belong to their neighbors. Looking around for something to grab, they find that all the land available for colonization has already been taken.

Italy found Ethiopia the last free spot in Africa with a government of her own. Ethiopia was a member of the League and even though Italy herself had insisted that she be admitted and had a few years before covenanted with her to "respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of Ethiopia," that made no difference. What are honor

and self-respect that they should weigh in the balances against the assumed right of a government to do as it pleases.

Still there are hungry nations; that is, nations hungry for land and the glory that goes with it. Now that Africa is all taken up and China is at present at the mercy of Japan, there is no other place or opportunity for expansion. Make an imaginary trip around the world, starting from New York and going east and south. You will pass the Azores and Madeira Islands. Here you will see the Portuguese flag. The north shore of Africa belongs to Spain and France. Egypt and Palestine are closely linked to England; lands on both sides of the Red Sea are held in suzerainty to or belong absolutely to England, France or Italy. Aden is English. India, Ceylon and the Straits Settlements are English. The islands in this region belong for the most part to Holland and England. Indo-China is French; Hong-Kong is English; Formosa is Japanese; Shanghai is an international settlement controlled by the western powers. Japan is the first country we see that belongs in its entirety to its inhabitants and who rule themselves without outside interference. From Japan back to the United States we pass the Midway and the Hawaiian Islands, and these are American territory. The original owners of the world live on their own lands as pensioners on the bounty of the great powers. The white man has taken most

of the world and uses it for his own pleasures and interests although the proportion of white to other races is as follows:

Total world population, approximately 2,000,000,000
Total white population in world,
approximately 700,000,000

In other words, there are approximately two members of the darker races to every one white person.

With the development of our industrial society, nations have come to depend more and more upon imports. In order to import, the producing nation must have not only access to the raw materials needed but also a large degree of control over the supply of these materials. The production of saleable goods is the business of private enterprise, but the government is involved, for it is only through political control that the users of the raw materials can be assured of a monopoly, and without such monopoly, under present conditions and arrangements, they cannot successfully compete in the world markets. For instance, if the industrialists in Italy are to continue to manufacture and sell machinery, they must be assured of a continued supply of iron and steel. In normal peace times there is little difficulty but when war or a threat of war arises, at once the supply of this essential commodity becomes uncertain. The same is true of oil, cotton and a large number of other articles.

Every nation, therefore, seeks new territories within which will be found as much of the staple raw materials as are demanded by its own industrial life. This was the chief motive for Japan's aggression in Manchuria and Italy's inhuman enterprise in Ethiopia. Germany is making the same demand. Whatever we may think of the methods employed to help themselves, we at least must admit the validity of the reasons which led to the exploit. No one doubts the intelligence of a gang of expert bank robbers. They have certain very definite needs and to supply them they follow a course of action that requires courage, and although it usually leads to disaster in the long run, it often succeeds.

The fundamental trouble is that all of the nations proceed in their common life on the assumption that wars are inevitable and that they will occur within the limits of a comparatively short cycle. Therefore the whole life of a nation is conducted on a war basis even in peace times.

The nations today threatening trouble are those whose populations have increased to such an extent that there is no longer enough land to produce sufficient food for all. Japan, Germany and Italy all fall into this category. Japan and Italy have helped themselves and Germany is getting ready to do the same thing. The primary responsibility of every government is to feed the people, or at least make it possible for them to feed themselves. It was hunger

more than any other one thing that led to the French Revolution. There were in France toward the end of the eighteenth century twenty-five million hungry people and one million who lived at ease, in comfort and without responsibility. The twenty-five million did all the work, paid the taxes, and starved. When human nature could stand no more the dams burst and the tidal flood of wrath swept the Bourbons out of power. Hitler at the Nuremberg Congress on September 9, 1936, speaking of this revolution, drew a parallel with the present conditions in Germany. He said:

The problems which weigh upon our nation are terribly difficult. One hundred and thirty-six persons live on each square kilometer of land in Germany. In spite of our best efforts, and by utilizing most efficiently every inch of earth, the people are not able to find all their food inside Germany. It is on the other hand impossible to import into Germany enough food to compensate for this deficit, for unfortunately Germany does not have a number of important raw materials. The only way out is for Germany to manufacture and to sell her goods abroad. This she cannot do, for she fails to control the source of a sufficient supply of essential raw materials. The matter of food is not discussed with evil intent, as some foreign statesmen seem to think, but is a task of vital importance for us. The exportation of industrial products is necessary to the importation of food. When an English politician declares that Germany has no need of colonies, for she is able to buy as others do the essential raw materials in any and every market,

this response is given in the same spirit as that response of the well-known Princess of the Bourbon family when the revolutionaries demanded bread. "If they have no bread," said she, "let them eat cake."

This is one of the clearest and best statements Hitler or anyone else has made on this question. Here we have a fair presentation of the issue. The present German Government must provide food for the people, or the people will rebel. The food cannot be produced from the soil of Germany alone. What then can be done? There are four courses of action:

(1) Germany can be given colonies where the needed additional food can be produced, where she will have control of essential raw materials and a place for the colonization of her excess population.
(2) Germany can send out the surplus population to colonize in other lands and on other continents.
(3) Germany can limit the increase of her population so that there will develop in time an equilibrium between population and food supply.
(4) Germany can speed up her industrial life; produce more manufactured goods; sell them in foreign markets and with the profits from the transaction buy food and raw materials.

We are using Germany simply as an illustration. Japan and Italy are for the time-being satisfied, but they have not solved the fundamental problem. Poland is in almost as precarious a position as Ger-

many, and among the smaller states are many who feel aggrieved and dissatisfied.

Let's be realistic and consider the four solutions that are proposed. First of all, if her colonies are returned to Germany, will that satisfy her demands? For the time-being it will salve her hurts and bolster up her vanity but it will not solve the underlying economic problems, nor will it meet the demand for a place into which her surplus population can expand. In the period of 1910-13, when Germany was at the zenith of her power and prestige, her trade with her colonial possesions was as follows:[1]

1910	*1911*	*1912*	*1913*
0.4	0.54	0.54	0.5

Before the war, according to all records available, Germany fed a large part of her people with food imported from abroad and only a small proportion of this food or of the raw materials used in her industries came from her own colonies. It was the war that created the new factors and raised the present pressing problems. But for the war Germany could easily have continued to feed her people and carry on her industrial and commercial life almost, if not fully, independent of her colonial possessions.[2]

[1] Quoted from *The Demand for Colonies*, page 27, by Lionel Birch.

[2] For a full discussion of this angle of the question, refer to a pamphlet published by the British League of Nations Union under the title *The Demand for Colonies.*

Italy has made no success of her colonies in Africa. After forty years of attempted colonization in Eritrea the total population there engaged in agricultural pursuits, according to a report made in 1935, was 84 persons. The results in Somaliland are even more deplorable. For forty years Italy has poured into these two colonies an annual subsidy of approximately 60,000,000 lire.

Another fact that should be borne in mind is that the giving of colonies is not an answer to the demand for "free access to raw materials." What it really means is that the cards will simply be reshuffled. Germany does not want "free access to raw materials" except by a means that will shut off access to everyone but herself. The dissatisfied nations want absolute control and not freedom of trade for all nations. They demand the right to open or close the door at their will. Colonies do not afford an answer to the question of a surplus population.

It is rather an interesting thing to study the history of colonization in Africa. For instance, outside of the British colonies in South Africa, there are less than a million white settlers who have gone from the various countries that own these colonies. I believe that figure is correct. I think, in fact, it is not more than 700,000 from all countries who live in the lands in that part of Africa owned by the imperial nations. When Mussolini made his attack

upon Ethiopia it was pointed out by him that Italy needed an outlet for millions of her people, and the experts figured that the tableland of Ethiopia provided a suitable place for habitation under the best conditions perhaps in the whole of Africa for about 2,000,000 excess population. This number could live there happily and prosperously. But these same experts said that to put 2,000,000 Italians in Ethiopia would require ten years. Now in Italy there is an aggregate of births over deaths every year of 500,000 people. Figure this out for yourself. Let us be realistic about this. In ten years Italy does what no other colonizing power has ever been able to do in Africa. She actually sends to Ethiopia 2,000,000 Italians. But at the end of the ten years she will have 5,000,000 more Italians than she had when she began to send her excess population to Ethiopia and some place will have to be found for colonizing this new "excess." Now where is Mussolini going to look for another place that he can annex and to which he can send these people? By geographical progression, at the present rate, the Italians will increase so that at the end of the century God only knows where territory can be found sufficient for them to occupy.

Of course, Italy is not sincere in this thing because, like Japan and Germany, she is encouraging an increase in the birth rate trying to raise it as high as possible. She is offering premiums for larger

families and her face is resolutely set against every effort at logical, reasonable birth control. This is the crux of the whole matter. There is plenty of land on the earth, but as long as nations consider greatness on the basis of the strength and number of the armies they can put in the field against their neighbors, it is not a question of economic need but of national prestige that controls the solution.

We have the same thing in the United States in another form. The Americans do not want colonies; we have all the land we need; but just let anyone attempt to touch our tariff and pull down those artificial walls and he touches what is almost sacred to him. Our national prestige is bound up with our desire to hold old markets and control and find new ones, even when our government knows that a high protective tariff is ruining our own trade. We are unwilling to concede for a minute that we should submit our economic plans to any group from any other nation. We do not want to cooperate because economic imperialism, in the mind of the American, is the open road to national greatness. We in the midst of a depression complained of what other nations have done—their tariffs, their quotas. It is interesting, but not very comforting, for an American to remember that every one of these ingenuous devices for strangling trade and hindering the free flow of commerce was hatched out in the brain of some American indi-

vidual or committee that wanted to protect its own economic interests, or that tried to find a means by which it could maintain a dollar hedge around the world.

The next thing in this whole consideration is this: that underlying the appeal for colonies and the problems of raw materials lies the whole question of war. Nations want access to raw materials. They do not want any international agreement by which you can send a quota to Germany and a quota to Japan, to France, to Italy, and to other nations: every nation wants to control the source and then, with their colonial possessions, they will be able to hold a position so strong that when war comes they will be able to dominate their neighbors. The preparation for war is the foundation stone in this whole structure. If we can get our churches and religious institutions to accept the standard set up by the nations when they adopted the Briand-Kellogg Pact, then we can settle these questions, and we can settle them quickly.

There are after forty years in all the African colonies of Italy only about five thousand Italians, nearly all of whom are government employees. In 1913 Germany had in all her colonies less than 20,000 settlers of German origin. At the outbreak of the war there were more Germans in Paris than in all of Germany's overseas possessions. Japan, along with Italy and Germany, is constantly urging

her need for colonies, and yet, as Norman Angell pointed out, she has had for forty years colonial territories with relatively sparse population and these colonies have in all this period "taken less than one year's increase of the Japanese population."[3]

Granted the needs of nations like Italy, Germany, and Japan (and no one who knows the facts questions the serious problems which these nations face), a mere redistribution of colonies will not meet the economic problems nor ease off the difficulties raised by a surplus population.

The second proposal is that Germany send her surplus population out into other lands and let them colonize under other flags. This is not practicable at present. Every nation has felt the full effect of the economic debacle. Unemployment and hard times are universal. Nearly every nation has erected new barriers against aliens and cut off immigration. Brazil and a few other countries in South America offer land and opportunity for colonization, but at best they could only accept a small proportion of the annual increase. No nation will accept any large group from another country and permit them to create a "foreign colony" in competition to and apart from the national groups. The sense of national dignity and prestige on the part of the colonizing

[3] See article by Sir Norman Angell, "The Spectator," Sept. 20, 1935.

nation will not allow a surplus of its people to be lost to the nation. The very basis of the Nazi government is the idea of *Folkstum*, that is, the total interests, culture and values, as well as the complete solidarity of the German people. "Wherever the German language is spoken, there is the fatherland." This cuts right across all our conventional ideas of a nation and its relations to other nations.

The Italians in the Argentine Republic, as long as they remain loyal to their adopted government, are accepted on the same basis as other citizens, but when the Italian group becomes the exponent of a new Fascism in South America, then there is trouble. The same is true in the United States. We do not question a man's racial or linguistic background until he becomes a "hyphenated American." There is no place in the United States for citizens who are German-American or Italian-American or Jewish-American or Irish-American. We are all Americans first in our loyalty to our country and its institutions. The government makes no distinctions and only requires that they who become citizens shall give undivided loyalty to the new country of their choice. Other nations feel the same and act upon this principle. To be realistic we must recognize that Germany is not so much concerned about what to do with the surplus population as she is to find an outlet that at the same time will increase rather than decrease the prestige and power

of the German nation. The same is true of Italy, Japan, and all the other nations who find themselves with the same problem on their hands. There is space enough for all the people on the earth—they crowd each other because of the artificial means dictated by national politics.

The third proposal is that Germany limit the increase of her population. This suggestion meets with no approval. "Aryan fanatics" are talking of a Germany with 150,000,000 people; a great empire dominating the culture, commerce and politics of Europe and the world. Rosenberg bases his arguments in favor of more colonies on the need for a German population of this size. Italy and Japan are asking for a maximum of births, while at the same time demanding public interest in their need for new territories for their "surplus populations."

There are fortunately other forces at work in the world and these are helping to ease off the sharpness of the problem. In spite of Hitler's demand that the birth rate in Germany be brought up to 21 per 1000 and held there, it has reached barely 18 per 1000. In spite of patriotic appeals and subsidies for parenthood, the birth rate in Italy has fallen from 39 births per thousand in 1887 to 23 per thousand in 1932. Responsible statisticians and actuaries, not politicians, estimate that the highest population of Germany at its zenith will be about seventy million. There is plenty of room on the earth for all the

people and by utilizing science and more intensive methods of producing food there will always be enough for all. The economic problems are the result of man's selfishness and short-sightedness. But it is not realistic to believe that the military nations will make any attempt to limit the increase of their man power. As long as "glittering prizes may be won at the point of a sharp sword," so long will the women of these countries be urged to "contribute to the common welfare and glory of the nation" by giving the nation a son each year.

We turn last of all to the fourth proposal, that Germany speed up her industry so as to produce more manufactured goods; sell them in the foreign markets and with the profits from the transaction buy food for her people and the raw materials necessary to continue the process. This is the real solution of the question, but it will require arrangements between the nations themselves. If Italy, Germany and Japan make and sell goods in the open market, it means of course the other nations making the same goods and offering them for sale in the same markets will have to make concessions. Free competition has its limits, as is evidenced by frequent rate wars and in recent years by a process of flooding the markets known as "dumping."

Imagine, if you can, a situation where the merchants of free nations are attempting vigorously to undersell each other and take the best for them-

selves. The process usually degenerates into a competition not between the makers and sellers of the articles, but between the nations themselves. For instance, take the case of oil. We do not think of the Standard Oil Company competing with the Anglo-Persian Oil Company so much as we do of American oil competing in the open markets of the world against British-controlled oil. In a recent article the writer told of a race between three oil tankers. One was loaded with Sinclair, another with oil from Roumania, the third with oil loaded in Persia. In the description, however, the writer refers to the American, Roumanian and British "forcing their vessels at top speed, each with the hope that its oil would arrive before the other two."

This question of agreement in the economic field, especially in the selling end, is a thorny one. It is not easy to make adjustments in our own home markets. When you get outside of that and nationalism comes in, it becomes still more complicated. However, we must remember that all of our modern life tends toward closer coordination of all of the factors and forces that enter into it. We cannot live in a city without recognizing our responsibilities to each other. We are constantly adjusting ourselves to new conditions; are always faced with the problem of how we can carry on our own business, safeguard our own interests, and at the same time fit into the social scheme in such a

way that we will become good citizens and not disturbers of the peace. The nations must learn this, too. "A house divided against a house falleth." A community divided against itself opens the door for anarchy and disaster of every kind. A nation divided against itself presents a spectacle such as we saw in 1861-65 in America, and such as one sees in Spain right now. The nations have to learn this same lesson, for a world divided against itself is a lost world.

The only way that the nations can solve these questions is through conference, and every conference that is successful succeeds because the conferees are able to find a successful formula by which they can compromise their difficulties.

At the meeting of the World Alliance in Chamby in August, 1936, representatives from twenty-four nations discussed this whole question and in a most significant statement called for a conference in this spirit. Here is a very real beginning. The intense and increasing gravity of the world situation and the present failure, said these churchmen, impel us to place on record the following decisions:

1. A new and better beginning in world affairs is essential. Adjustments in the structure and procedure of the League of Nations will be useful, but more is needed. A different spirit is required, a spirit which aims at effective service of the common good. We believe that the solution of the world problem is to be sought in the

Christian Faith, whence comes the power to change the motive and direction of personal and public activity.

2. A way must be found to bring under impartial survey the economic grievances and other inequities out of which the anxieties and fears of nations grow and which account in large measure for the fateful race in armaments.

We urge that the League of Nations, acting in conjunction with those States not included in its membership, should convene, after due preparation but at the earliest practicable date, a World Conference on these subjects, open to all States. Protective tariffs and financial obstacles to world trade, inability to obtain raw materials and an outlet for excess populations, and the future administration of colonial possessions and mandated territories would necessarily be among the subjects with which such a Conference should deal. As regards the colonial problem we hold strongly that a primary consideration should be the welfare of the races who inhabit the territories concerned.

3. We recognize that a special responsibility rests on the Christian Churches in this hour. Hence we ask that the Churches urge upon their several Governments, the necessity for such a World Conference, whether convened by the League of Nations or under other auspices. Each of our National Councils should take early action in this matter.

The criticism is made that those who seek a specific solution of these questions ignore facts. This need not be so. The risks of militarism are far greater than those of pacifism. Aldous Huxley says: "Militarism cannot fail to lead us into war,

whereas pacifism has a very good chance of preventing war from breaking out." On the question of a World Conference to take the place of military preparedness, he says:

> When the Conference has met it would be possible, given intelligence and goodwill, to work out a scheme of territorial, economic and monetary readjustments for the benefit of all. That certain immediate sacrifices would have to be made by the monopolistic powers is inevitable. These sacrifices would be in part sacrifices of economic advantages, in part, perhaps mainly, of prestige—which is the polite and diplomatic word for pride and vanity. It is unnecessary to go into details here. Suffice it to say that there would have to be agreement as to the supply of tropical raw materials; an agreement on monetary policy; an agreement with regard to industrial production and markets; an agreement on tariffs; an agreement on migration.[4]

All thoughtful people, those interested in a constructive effort for peace, realize that the only way out is through conference and agreement, which is the antithesis of conflict and military preparation and war.

[4] *What Are You Going to Do About It? The Case for Constructive Peace.* By Aldous Huxley. Pamphlet of the British League of Nations Association.

CHAPTER NINE

NATIONALISM

THE State is the expression of a people's desire for unity. Its development is easily traced through the family, the tribe and the community. Toward the end of the eighteenth century, French absolutism had brought about such a reaction and such a protest that the majority of the people found themselves in revolt against the State itself. Writers like Voltaire, Diderot, and particularly Jean Jacques Rousseau, were examining anew the foundations upon which the State is built. The belief current at that time was that the State is ordained by God and that man must fit himself into a preordained relationship. An individual, according to this theory, can no more escape the responsibilities and duties imposed by the State than he can escape from the shape of his head or the texture of his brain. It is a part of him, born with him, and he must fit himself into the niche prepared for him.

Against this theory Rousseau propounded the doctrine that the State is a social contract entered into freely by individuals, that you pledge yourself to the State and the State pledges itself to its

citizens. This contract is binding upon the two parties—the State and the individual. The State must fulfill its requirements and in return the individual carries out his obligations. Both the State and the individual profit by the mutual arrangement. This idea of a social contract was the dynamite that blew up the old concept of the divine origin of the State and its supreme authority over the lives and property of individuals. It opened wide the way for revolution and gave wide place for anyone who chose to rebel against authority.

Later on, this theory gave way to a concept of the State as an organism, something that grows up naturally out of the needs of man and develops as a social phenomenon. A study of evolution and the development of the science of sociology, as well as deeper studies in anthropology, economics and history, confirm this view. The State is a natural development of man's gregarious instinct. Reason teaches us that there is strength in unity, and the State is accepted as a part of our social organism simply because of its value, because with it man can be safer, more contented, and enjoy more through the State than he could without it.

Whatever may be the fundamental concept of the State, one of the first questions that arises relates to authority. Historically this subject has received more attention than any other. From the very earliest days men, as they have sought to live in an

ordered society, have realized that there must be some authority strong enough to guide those who are willing to be taught, reward those who do right, and punish those who do wrong.

The simplest form of State authority is that of autocracy, or the rule of the absolute monarch or the strong man. His will is final. He is the law. The most complicated form of authority is that exercised by democracy. Here instead of having one will, the will of the group must be expressed through legislation, and legislation leads to almost endless discussion and talk. Louis XIV represented the absolute State in its highest development in his dictum, "I am the State." There was no place for legislative action, no need for popular elections. The State spoke in the words of the King and the State acted in his decrees. The difficulty of this kind of dictatorship was that time moves on, and with the movement of time people began to be educated. They began to think for themselves. From the days of Magna Carta down to the present the struggle has been for more and more expression on the part of the people themselves. Democracy may not be very effective and popular self-government may fail, but in the process men and women are becoming more competent, more capable, of ruling themselves.

Is it possible to maintain effective government unless the individual judgment and interests are subordinated to the collective judgment of the

State? To answer this negatively forces one to accept the philosophy of anarchy. The Church has a peculiar and definite responsibility as the custodian of the Christian conscience. The Church represents the religious ideal of the individual. It educates his conscience. It is also the teacher of the State in those matters which affect the soul and conscience of man. The Church has the duty, as an important organism within the State, to preach and work to keep the actions of the State at the highest point of moral efficiency. In these particulars, if the Church is allowed to exist at all, it is superior to the State. Now the dilemma that presents itself is this: can the Church be permitted to exist if it is in any particular superior to the State? Secondly, is the Church, by its very organization and function, always the advocate of anarchy?

The easy solution of the difficulty is to admit that the State has the power, and insofar as it is willing to exercise it, the right to force the conscience of individuals and even of the Church to its will. To do this, however, is to deny the whole course of procedure of modern democratic government. A government which goes to such extremes reverts to the ancient ideas of autocracy. All modern democratic governments accept the idea of equality of all before the law and absolute freedom of conscience and consequently grant full religious freedom to all citizens. If there were some way by

which the conscience of individuals could be standardized and classified, it would not be so difficult to settle this question. If all men in the State felt alike and their consciences responded to the same stimuli, all you would need to do would be to appoint a commission, study the things that they ought to do, and then consider the effect that they would have upon the standardized conscience. This, of course, is utterly impossible and no one would take seriously such a suggestion. Individual conscience means specialization. There are certain fundamental reactions that are the same in all sane, right-thinking individuals, but one's relationship to the State, to the Church, to the family, to the home, to the community, to one's daily work, is an individual matter. When we create a public conscience we do not create something new, or something that necessarily dominates the individual conscience. It is merely the aggregate of what a large number of people think and feel, and the moment that the public conscience is taken by any external authority as an unalterable guide for individual action, even if it be for the good of the individual, the State moves out of its own sphere of responsibility. In such a situation public opinion becomes a coercive force and is no longer representative of the consciences of the people.

Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin represent different points of view and have a different philosophy on

which they base their claims, but they agree on the fundamental principle that the State is final and that man was made for the State and not the State for man. Mussolini says: "The State embraces everything and nothing outside the State has value. The State makes right." There can be no mistaking Il Duce when he talks in this strain. Hitler adds his mite in these words: "The State dominates the nation because it alone represents it." Where does the individual and the average citizen fit into this scheme? Lenin gives the answer: "It is nonsense to make any pretence of reconciling the State and individual liberty."

The Fascist State, George Seldes says, is not a new idea.[1] Germany and Italy have turned the clock back. Mussolini's patriotism, prestige, order, discipline and hierarchy are the foundation of every authoritarian State. His totalitarian dictatorship faces the fact that every autocracy in history up to modern times has ended in revolution or war. Our Il Duce sits with revolver on his desk, intent on outwitting history.

These are all various expressions of the same ideal. It is not altogether true to say that this concept of the State neglects the individual, but it does destroy all initiative and leaves the individual units merely cogs in a huge machine. There is no place for the exercise of intelligence and free will, or

[1] *Sawdust Caesar,* by George Seldes, Harper & Brothers.

the development of the conscience in the totalitarian State. The individual may be well-fed, may be well-clothed, and well-housed. There is no doubt but what Fascism has been beneficial in that it has added to the material welfare and physical comfort of the people. Mussolini has provided and continues to provide bread and circuses for the Roman crowd. Just as long as that goes on, he will be able to justify himself and little criticism will be heard.

When the Republican soldiers in 1789 threw down the Bastille they gave humanity's answer to absolutism. This event marked not only a definite step forward, but raised a barrier against any further permanent imprisonment of the spirit of man. Let us emphasize the word *permanent*. Dictatorship and totalitarian States may last for a few years, but their lease of life is short. Dictatorships will arise from time to time, but their genesis is in the confusion and turmoil of universal catastrophe, and their duration of power will be no longer than it takes to bring about order from confusion in the minds of the people. These dictatorships begin with a great show of enthusiasm but always end in disaster. "The mutilated body of Matteotti is tied inextricably to the Fascist State." His ghost is ever at the side of Mussolini. The "blood bath" in Germany has added a new stain to the history of that unhappy land, and the killing of his enemies and the ruthlessly putting down of opposition to himself

personally marks Stalin as one of the modern world's most brutal rulers.

Germany has been guilty of some of the most outrageous practices of any nation or group of individuals since the Middle Ages. There is nothing in the long annals of man's inhumanity to man that is any more frightful than the methods used in applying the laws limiting citizenship in the Reich to those of Aryan blood. If Germany had wanted to promulgate a principle of that kind and by legal procedure had deprived Jews and Christians of Jewish descent of their rights, but at the same time had arranged so that they could continue their life and their work in Germany, it would still be a cruel injustice practiced upon a large and influential body of the German people. It, however, would be a German problem, and while the rest of the world might feel that it was unwise and unjust, there would be no practical purpose in making a protest and no reason why anyone should attempt to interfere. But when Germany expels from her country hundreds of thousands of her own citizens and throws them out into neighboring countries without any means of livelihood and leaves them to starve, then it becomes an international problem.

Forms of government do not fight battles, but the people lined up behind those forms fight each other. Constantly we are having it dinned into our

ears that Fascism is saving the world from Communism. There is little to choose from either one of these types of government. We want no dictatorship, no totalitarian State; we want neither Fascism nor Communism. Democracy is the hope of the world. Democracy is the basis of religion. But if such dogmatic statements are not to be merely the claptrap of the soapbox orator, how can we free ourselves from these two forces which at present dominate such a large part of the world? Nicholas Murray Butler, speaking in New York City some time ago, said that the world appears to be at the crossroads, which is the outcome of political, social, and economic forces developing for two centuries and which now presents the question whether man can govern himself in civil and economic liberty with others, or must spend his life under the rule of despotism.

Nationalism becomes a disturber of the world's peace whenever for the sake of prestige and glory the independent State considers itself free to act without regard to its relationship to its neighbors. America, or any other nation, has a right to proceed as it pleases in developing its own life, but we cannot avoid the consequences of that action. Ever since the Armistice the United States of America has been responsible for a large part of the disorder and the uncertainty which led to the great economic collapse. As a nation we put our hand to the plow

and then looked back. We went into the war on a wave of enthusiasm for democracy and came out with a sullen determination to play the game no farther. Childishly we tried to withdraw within ourselves and have nothing to do with the rest of the world. The war had cost us something like twenty-five billion dollars and we had owing to us from the allied nations about eleven billion dollars in war debts. Germany was forced to pay the expenses of the war, but she had no means of paying. England paid a few installments on her debt to the United States, but all the money that was paid to America came from Germany to England, and the money that Germany sent to England was in turn lent to her by the United States. As a consequence, in addition to the money that the war cost us and the debts that are owed us by our associates in the war, we added to that about three billion dollars of new money lent to Germany.

A small group in America was able to defeat the will of the majority and keep us out of the League of Nations. Whatever the merits of the issue might be, let's be realistic. The world got into a bad state of affairs. A world war ensued. We were sucked into the strife. At the end of the war we were in a better position than anybody else to help settle the difficulty. Instead of that, having made more out of the war than anybody else (before we went in at any rate) and with our prosperity at its highest

point, we withdrew from the rest of the world. We were strong on advice. "You Europeans got into this mess, now set your own house in order." One of the isolationists made the brilliant statement: "America is not withdrawing from the world, but will only mix in European affairs when our financial and commercial interests are involved." Borah, being more forthright, said: "Let Europe stew in its own juice."

Our refusal to cooperate with the rest of the world has up to the present left only uncertainty and misapprehension. America is so big and exerts such a large influence throughout the world that other nations can say of her, as Frederick the Great said of Voltaire, "I can't get on with him, and I can't get on without him." But not only in the political realm has nationalism caused confusion. Our nation has been among the leaders in maintaining high tariffs and setting up other false economic gods. We have created nearly every one of the economic devices for hampering trade against which we protest today, including the quota system. The result is that the crash that came to Europe carried American prosperity down with it. Our foreign trade, we are reminded, is only about ten per cent of our total trade, but it is that ten per cent that marks the difference between prosperity and poverty. After the bitter experience of these years we realize now that we are a part of the world and

the Hon. Cordell Hull deserves all credit for moving forward in his efforts to secure reciprocal trade agreements.[2] In spite of the lessons of recent years, certain big interests of this country are fighting to destroy these agreements. What is the result of our hesitation? Take as an example the cotton industry. Over a period of five years ending in 1929, the average production of cotton in the United States compared with foreign production was at the ratio of 15 to 10. Fifteen million bales produced in the United States; ten million bales outside. In 1935 these figures had changed so that production in the United States was 10 to 16. In other words, the picture had completely changed so that while production in America had decreased about five million bales, the production outside had increased by six million bales. The reason for this change is that the foreign nations dependent upon cotton are determined that they will not risk their future in the hands of America; consequently, people of ten southern states face a serious and new crisis on account of the trade policies of our government.[3]

The same thing is true in other great industries. The politician befuddles the American mind. The

[2] For full discussion of this question, *America Must Act*, by Francis B. Sayre. A World Affairs book, published by National Peace Conference, 8 West 40th St., New York City.

[3] For full discussion of this question, *The Cotton State and American Trade Policy*, by Peter Molyneaux. A World Affairs book, published by National Peace Conference, 8 West 40th St., New York City.

business man too often plays up or down to class interest. Tears of sympathy are now being shed by middlemen who have evinced an interest in the western farmer because of our trade agreements with Canada. Another illustration is that the manufacturers of plate glass have hired a lobby and are bringing great pressure upon the legislators in Washington to have the trade agreement relating to this industry annulled. The old Hebrew prophet said: "O, my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err and destroy the way of thy paths." This is exactly what has been happening in the United States since 1918, and we are still walking in a false path. This is about the best illustration we can have in which selfish, economic and commercial interests tie themselves up to national interest. What would not be done by business men making a living in the community and competing with each other in a friendly spirit is done by the same men when their trade crosses national frontiers.

Nationalism, then, has taken on a bad meaning. It is one of those words that has gotten into bad company. Nationalism means, in the common usage of that word, that the individual State presses its claims not only against the individual, destroys conscience and individual freedom, but carries its selfishness to such extremes in its relations with other States that war and preparation for war becomes its chief and almost exclusive activity. Nationalism,

pressed to its extreme, means not only that the State exercises complete authority over its own citizens, is dominant within its own territory, but it can stand no rivals anywhere. Its "place in the sun" nas come to mean that there is such a place for one and only one nation.

We ask of the individual what right has he within the State. We may ask of the State itself what rights has it in relation to the rights of other States. To answer this question it is necessary to ask others. What are the intentions of the State? Is its main business to take the territory of weaker peoples in order that it may become stronger? May a State expropriate lands belonging to another State? May it exploit the diamond, ruby and gold mines? May it legitimately form a monopoly of all the natural resources of the land it has taken by aggression, such as its tea, its coffee, its cocoanuts, its oil, its ores, and its precious stones? In order to annex the State, it has perhaps had to carry on a ruthless warfare by means of gas and bombs, airplanes, high-powered guns. It has killed a large proportion of the original inhabitants of the country. May it now legitimately turn over their lands to settlers for settlement by the conquerors?

If the State exists for the purpose of increasing its prestige and power and wealth through the acquisition of lands and raw materials, then of course we must continue the old war system, for

until the States come together and agree upon the fundamental rules that shall govern them in their common life with each other we will have nothing but anarchy and disorder. Booker T. Washington used to say that the only way you can hold a man down in the ditch is by getting down into the ditch with him. The same thing is true of the nations. The only way that the aggressor can keep the subjugated people under control is by the use of force. Great armies and great navies are companions to the idea of a great State with its dominant place foremost among the great nations of the world. Colonial power and the prestige that it brings, more than the actual need of a place as an outlet for their people or a source of raw material, are behind much of the war preparation that is going on in every part of the world. Japan's need to dominate China grows out of her desire to be the head of a great colonial system, a great empire, just as Mussolini writes with such a flourish of the Italian Empire, not merely the Italian Kingdom.

What is a realistic attitude that right-minded people can take and should take toward the State? Nationalism and internationalism are not antagonistic parts. Our love for our own country and our belief that it is the best country ought not to be put into antithesis to our love for other countries and appreciation of the contributions they are making to our common humanity. It is only when we allow

this wrong interpretation to be put upon these terms that we find ourselves in difficulty. The State is not the final ideal, and patriotism is not enough. A man may be as selfish in his love for his State as he would be in his love for himself or for his own family. The best citizen is the man who loves his family, takes care of his family, believes his family is the equal and perhaps from his standpoint just a little more interesting that any other in the community, but at the same time he cannot stop with the border of his own property or the front door of his own house. He and his family will be scorned by the neighbors if they attempt to live a life of such detachment that they fail in their share of responsibility for the common interests of their local community.

Every individual has a number of loyalties and it is difficult to say which is highest. Only one of them is final in any true sense of the word and that is the loyalty of every individual to his own conscience. Beyond that all loyalties are relative. We owe a loyalty to the State in the realm in which the State serves and where it has its claims upon us. We owe a loyalty to the Church, which at certain points exceeds our loyalty to the State. (At other points our loyalty to the State exceeds our loyalty to the Church.) In the same way we have our loyalty to our group, our loyalty to our friends, our loyalty to our home, our loyalty to our trades union, our loyalty to the club, our loyalty to our work and to

our associates. Now these loyalties need not clash, and they do not clash, except when one group in the community assumes a place that does not belong to it. The task of modern democracy is to provide for the education of the individual so that he will find his place in the community and will give to each the loyalty that it has a right to demand of him. This is the ideal of religion and is the only way by which the States can find their way out of the difficulties which beset them at the present time.

Nationalism is not in itself an evil thing. It is evil only when we allow it to become so dominant that we can take pride in even the cruelties that have made most of the nations great, i.e., destroying weaker peoples and stealing their lands. Patriotism should be kept at a level as great and noble as most of us believe it to be, but as long as the highest ideal of patriotism is "to die for one's country," whether that country be right or wrong, we will not get away from war and the war system. To love one's country and to serve that country and to be willing to live for it and sacrifice for it in order that it may take and hold its rightful place among the other nations of the world—this is the true ideal of nationalism. And if we are to judge from the failures that the great States have made in maintaining the peace of the world, surely this is the only realistic concept of the State; for, after all, what will it profit a State if it gain the whole world and lose its own soul?

CHAPTER TEN

EDUCATION

A PROMINENT English schoolman, speaking of the efficiency of modern technical education, said: "I agree with Professor Gilbert Murray. We are failing in giving the rising generation in democratic countries a true education, and everywhere men are being trained not to be world citizens but to be 'mad dogs.'" All the nations signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact, in which they solemnly stated that they "condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies," and pledged themselves to renounce war as an instrument of international policy in their relations with one another. But in spite of that pledge, every nation is busy preparing for the next war. Almost without exception individual nations are piling up armaments, so that at a conservative estimate the cost for 1937 will be approximately ten billion dollars. Nations are training millions of their men, adding to the forces of their standing armies, increasing their navies, and then behind it all organizing the school system so that compulsory military training is a part of all curricula. The main pur-

pose, it would seem, of the nations is to get ready for war, and as part of this preparation the popular mind must be militarized. On the other hand, everybody knows that if we are to have peace we must stop educating for war and educate for peace.

This was better stated by Secretary Cordell Hull in his speech at the Buenos Aires meeting on December 5, 1936, than in any statement that has been recently made.

> I would emphasize the local and unilateral responsibility of each nation carefully to educate and organize its people in opposition to war and its underlying causes. Support must be given to peace; to the most effective policies for its preservation, and, finally, each nation must maintain conditions within its own borders which will permit it to adopt national policies that can be peacefully pursued. More than any other factor, a thoroughly informed and alert public opinion in each country as to the suitable and desirable relationships with other nations and the principles underlying them enables a government in time of crisis to act promptly and effectively for peace.
>
> The forces of peace everywhere are entitled to function both through governments and through public opinion. The peoples of the world would be far wiser if they expended more of their hard-earned money in organizing the forces of peace and fewer of the present five billion dollars in educating and training their military forces.

Since the time when Thomas Jefferson insisted upon a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind," public opinion has controlled foreign policy in all democracies. It is, therefore, all-important that every pulpit and every

forum should become constant and active agencies in the great work of education and organization.

The limited extent of such highly organized and intelligent public opinion in support of peace is by far the largest drawback to any plan to prevent war. Truly the first step is that each nation must thus make itself safe for peace. This, too, develops a common will for freedom, the soil from which peace springs.

People everywhere should be made to know of the peace mechanisms. Even more, there should be brought home to them the knowledge that trade, commerce, finance, debts, communications have a bearing on peace. The workman at his bench, the farmer on his land, the shopkeeper by his shelves, the clerk at his books, the laborer in factory, plantation, mine or construction camp must realize that his work is the work of peace; that to interrupt it for ends of national or personal rapacity is to drive him toward quick death by bayonets, or to slower but not less grievous suffering through economic distress.

In all countries we have scholars who can demonstrate these facts; let them not be silent. Our churches have direct contact with all groups; may they remember that the peacemakers are the children of God. We have artists and poets who can distil their needed knowledge into trenchant phrase and line; they have work to do. Our great journals on both continents cover the world. Our women are awake; our youth sentient; our clubs and organizations make opinion everywhere. There is a strength here available greater than that of armies. We have but to ask its aid; it will be swift to answer, not only here, but in continents beyond the seas.[1]

[1] *The New York Times*, Dec. 6, 1936.

There is an old axiom that the training of the children of a nation up to the time they are sixteen years of age will set the mind of the nation for the next fifty years. In Russia the Communists started some years ago to destroy religion. They began by prohibiting any religious teaching, and then made an educational curriculum that inculcated anti-religious principles. A generation was educated on that principle and now today religion is practically non-existent in the whole realm. The result has been so complete and satisfactory from the Soviet Government's standpoint that in the new constitution they can afford to offer "complete religious liberty" to all of their people. Having bent the mind of the people away from religion, they now rest assured that any approach will be met at the threshold of every mind with its own safeguards against what they term "superstition."

Germany is doing the same thing. Baldur von Schirach is the chief of the Nazi Youth Movement. He is the most effective exponent of the new "kultur." He attacks the Church and is the first propagandist for the new German paganism. The Hitler Youth Organization forms a regular department in the Nazi government. This organization takes complete control of the child at the age of ten and follows him through school, allowing his church only to serve as an institution for administering sacraments and performing religious

service. The Church can take no part whatsoever in directing or providing sports, recreation, education, or training the youth in any way. Following the pattern of the Soviets, National Socialism has set out to possess the youth of the land body and soul, and, just as Russia claims the "iron unity of the youth ready to fill the front ranks of the Red Army for the defense of the Fatherland," so Hitler and his associates are claiming the youth of Germany for the same purpose. It is the same spirit that is leading the people to such extremes in adulation of Hitler. They see in the nation such a great future that they are willing to sacrifice for that coming day. To them it is easy to say, "less butter and more cannon."

In Italy we find the same methods and the same results. The Fascist youth are put into training for the military life at a very young age and the whole control of the life of the nation as expressed in its young people, boys and girls alike, is in the hands of this military machine.

All the dictatorships strive, first of all, to enthuse the young generation with their ideals and to train their minds so that they become impervious to any other concept. It is the way they seek to create an economy that is complete in itself and look out upon a world in which they will play the part as conquerors, or else play no part at all. In preaching against Communism and claiming to be the

saviors of the world from the menace of Communism, Nazi Germany is copying the same evils and making herself just the same kind of a menace as that from which she wishes to save mankind. In democratic countries, instead of controlling the education of the people, we believe in the freedom of the educational process. A free school is essential to a free land.

The reports which come through the United States Department of Education indicate that the question of international goodwill and the establishment of peace is gaining the attention of teachers and scholars in every part of the country. Reports from every state and territory reveal unceasing educational activity in behalf of peace. These efforts are found at every level from the kindergarten to adult classes. Correspondence, motion pictures, radio programs of international news adapted for children, junior forums, courses designed to break down racial prejudice and create understanding of the importance of international friendship are among the methods that are used in many schools and colleges.

We quote a few instances from a recent national educational report. The Board of Education in Kansas recommended that every high school in the state include in its curriculum a half-year course of study in international relations. An outline was officially prepared and printed for the use

of teachers. The stated aim is "to give the students a world outlook and conscience." Major units in this course of study include information about our neighbors; foreign affairs with a study of the State Department's American foreign policy; international governmental agencies; economic problems of international relations; causes of misunderstandings; the effects of war and a study of international organizations working for peace.

In Los Angeles there is a still more ambitious and more far-reaching program. It is called the Program of Training in World Friendship. A book was written describing this work, which has been used widely not only in our own country but has been translated into other languages and is being used in France, Germany, Japan, Sweden, Switzerland and in some of the South American countries. This program calls for attendance by teachers at lectures on world affairs by eminent authorities, the discussion of teaching international relations; special celebrations with pageants, and songs and addresses on Pan-American Day; International Goodwill Day; Annual Oratorical contests on world friendship; exchange of portfolios of schools with other lands, with the Junior Red Cross, organization of world friendship clubs in the high schools, and other features.

The schools are providing in many places weekly addresses on international affairs. Radio broadcasts

are taking the place in some of the schools of the usual exercises—the speakers from far distant points speak directly to the students on international relations. Motion pictures are brought into the classroom in the campaign against war. In one of the Middle West cities a series of Junior public forums have been promoted and are well-advertised and well-attended. These are under the direction and usually held in the auditorium of the high school. In these forums are discussed the major issues of the times, international as well as domestic. Those who have attended the meetings over a period of months report that these public forums have a distinct effect in creating broader tolerance on the part of the students.

The Junior Red Cross is another enterprise that is interesting the children in a study of wider international relations. Another small but interesting development has been that of the exchange among schools of various countries of albums or portfolios. In one year nearly four thousand assignments of this kind involving exchanges by schools in thirty-five countries passed through the American Red Cross headquarters in Washington.

Programs for peace teaching are becoming popular. According to a study of the National Education Association, the last fifteen years have witnessed great activity in the revision and improvement of school curricula designed to emphasize the

contribution which education can make to the solution of international difficulties. In addition to the actual teaching, principals in some two thousand high schools report that their schools have a total enrollment of over two hundred thousand students who are studying the Paris Pact at the present time and attempting to find how it can be made more effective. This is done in connection with the National Student Forum, of which Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, whose name is joined with that of Briand as the creator of the pact, is the chairman.

In addition to what has been taught in the schools, there is another strong educational force connected with our public school system and that is the Parent Teachers Association. In the local county, state and national associations the question of international relations and the technique of peace are popular subjects. The parents associated with these groups of course are interested because it is their boys who will be called to fight and they are determined that they will do their part to help educate the mind of America for peace instead of for war.

The army and navy and those who are responsible for maintaining the personnel are eager to get their hands on our educational institutions. The R.O.T.C. (Reserve Officers Training Corps) is designed primarily to build up a group of trained men large enough to serve as an adequate backbone

for the whole defensive system. But what is defence? No one seems to know, or if they do know will not tell. America is pledged to a no-war policy. Should we be invaded by an enemy from outside, the great majority of our people would not only support the use of force in repelling the enemy, but would be willing to take part in the exercise of that force. How much force do we need? What kind of protection should we have? Does our national defence require ships with a cruising radius of ten thousand miles? How large a regular army do we need? What would be the possible maximum need of men and what number of trained officers should be required? What proportion of our national income should be expended for defence?

Now these are questions that are never answered. In a discussion with the Chief of Staff of the United States Army some years ago, when this question was asked him, instead of answering it he flew into a rage. "When a boat starts from America can you tell what storms it is going to encounter?" His opponent replied: "That is true, but if that boat is so afraid of storms that eighty-five per cent of its space is utilized to carry lifeboats and its available space is filled with men to save the ship if it meets a storm, hadn't it better stay at the dock?" Instead of answering he picked up his papers and said to his corporal, "Come on,

there is no use of us fooling away any more time at a meeting of this kind."

As a matter of fact, we are the people who are going to be protected and it is our country that needs the protection. We are the ones who are to pay the bills. The army and navy people are simply our servants, doing a job for us, and we ought to have something to say about it. Certainly we in America are not willing to turn over our lives and our security and our future to the people who have been educated for war and who demand that that type of education, and that alone, should be perpetuated.

Because we have opposed the unlimited use of our high schools and our colleges for compulsory military training, the schools and the educational system are branded as communistic. Congress passed a law as a rider to the Appropriations Act for the District of Columbia, and this rider was attached after the bill had gone to conference. This law provides that "hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payment of the salary of any person teaching or advocating Communism." The bill was passed through so quietly that even the people most interested did not realize what had been done. It is related that when a newspaper reporter called the attention of Senator Borah to the act the Senator said, "That will never be passed so long as I

am in the Senate." But the joke was it had already been passed and Borah knew nothing about it. With the frightful struggle that is going on in the world today between Communism and Fascism, the teachers in Washington may teach all they please about Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy and the ambitions of Japan, but if they even mention the word "Communism" or attempt to teach anything concerning the government of Russia, they will be dismissed from the school. This cry of Communism is a red herring drawn across the path of democracy. The "red rider," so called, has made Congress ridiculous in the eyes of all thoughtful people. Representative Blanton, of Texas, was the only proponent of this bill in the House. He said, "The time has come when we Democrats must weed all pinks and reds out of our government. I have lowered my visor, I have unsheathed my sword, I am entering the lists, I am at war to the finish against all Communist and subversive enemies of good government." Brave words, but not overly intelligent.

A recent newspaper editorial characterized a current peace program sponsored by a number of peace agencies as "a two-year mobilization for peace directed by a united effort of many of the nation's leading Communists, Socialists, pacifists and radicals."

Why, we ask, should the attempt to teach peace

to the children of the country instead of war be looked upon as teaching subversive doctrines? Is making war an essential and sacred principle of a constitution and a government? There is no attempt, and never has been any attempt, to sovietize the schools of our country. The people who make such charges do so because they know that a generation of Americans educated in the technique of peace will be an inevitable bar to the carrying out of the full plans of the military groups. "We want no war, and less preparation for war" was the statement of one of our Presidents who was marked neither by great ability nor great breadth of vision, but what he said found an echo in every heart.

The churches have a big responsibility in educating for peace. They, by their very charter, are committed to the outlawry of war and the bringing in of world peace, and in many of the organizations they are putting in effect educational programs that are very much worthwhile. The Church press is filled with articles and editorials relating to international affairs. The Department of Epworth League and Young People's Work of the Methodist Church have put out a number of study courses. The material includes discussion on such varied subjects as: "What is War Like?"—"Why Do We Go to War?"—"What is Behind the Causes of War?"—"How Can We Work for Peace?"

The Federal Council of Churches, the World

Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, and the Peace Departments of the leading religious bodies are promoting systematic study of all these issues. There are school textbooks and literature available so that today through the story books, through the monthly magazines, through the Adult Bible Class Monthly, the Elementary Magazine, the Uniform Lesson Publications, the Group Lesson Publications for Children, the Intermediate Group Lessons, the Senior Group Lessons, the Elementary Graded Lessons, we have a complete curriculum extending from the cradle roll clear up to the adult classes.[2]

Twenty-five years ago there was not a single course offered on the question of international relations. A few lessons were devoted to the subject in a general sort of way, but no course of study was built on the conviction that war is anti-Christian, is contrary to the spirit of all religion, is unnecessary, and that if we will arouse ourselves and educate ourselves we can get rid of war.[3]

Education is the hope of democracy. Education, if it is to be effective, must be founded upon great religious principles. The Pilgrims left a concrete testimony of what they conceived to be the relationship between religion and education when

[2] See publications of: The Church Peace Union, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City. *Religion Renounces War,* by Walter Van Kirk.

[3] See Manifesto Against War, issued by The Church Peace Union.

"after building the church house, they built the school house hard by."

Let's be realistic about this whole question of education. If we want our nation to be the strongest military and naval establishment in the world, let's continue with the R.O.T.C. as a compulsory part of our educational system. Let's teach nationalism, let's play up the glories and splendors of the magnificent isolation that we can enjoy if we so desire. But let's not be hypocritical about it. Let us stop talking about wanting peace and at the same time preparing for war. If we go in for war-making, then by all means let's become so powerful and efficient that no nation or group of nations can stand against us or our will to power and conquest. On the other hand, if we mean what we say, if we are a peace-loving people, if we want no war and less preparation for war, if we are willing to pay the price for peace and have the blessings that come to nations as well as individuals for their efforts to promote peace, then let us support all the efforts that are being made by our educators and our churches to train the mind of the rising generation in the arts of peace and instill into them such a hatred for war that they cannot be deceived nor stampeded into actions that will involve our nation and themselves in endless disputes which are certain to end in bloodshed.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

RELIGION

CAN religion prevent war? Has the Church enough power to make a real contribution toward the establishment of right and just international relations? If you ask the man on the street what he thinks of religion as a force for peace, he will probably tell you that religion is a fighting force. Religion to him is represented in the rival sects in his home town—the Baptists, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Episcopalians, the Roman Catholics, the Greek Church and the Jewish congregations. These groups are continually quarreling among themselves over what appear to him trivial matters. He is forever confronted with the antagonism between Protestant and Catholic, Christian and Jew, and while these quarrels are going on the majority of the people in the community take no interest in either one side or the other. Fundamentalism and modernism, ritualism and revivalism will raise themselves against the slower processes of education within the churches and intellectual snobbery too often takes the place of a sincere interest in human welfare.

This may be the shortsighted and popular view of religion but there is so much truth in it that we need to pause and ask ourselves some very searching questions. Is a distinction to be made between religion and the Church? If you say that the Church is faulty and the criticism against it is justified, that it is really a hindrance to religion rather than a help, what then will you substitute for the Church? Religion is the force that binds men to God and to each other. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself." (Luke 10:27) This is the whole law and the Gospel. But, queer as it may seem, it is easier for most people to love God than it is for them to love their neighbors. We can get along with God or without Him apparently much easier than we can with the people with whom we live in this workaday world. Germans and French have no difficulties in praying to the same God, but they have great difficulty in recognizing themselves as brothers with the same God as Father, common to all. The theological nonsense that is being spun out in Germany at present to justify the treatment of Jews and non-Aryans—which everybody recognizes as a direct negation of everything that Christ taught—makes the Church in Germany ridiculous. The courageous few in the Confessional Synod are fighting valiantly against

this blasphemous twisting of the plain teaching of the Church.

If religion is to function, it must function through some kind of an organization. The multiplicity of churches, I believe, came not primarily through the perversity of man so much as through eagerness to find a better way to express his deepest religious sentiments. Such an inquiry as this opens up a tempting path but one into which we must not stray. If we are to be realistic, the thing we want to know is how religion can best express itself. Lecky points out that the early Christians were not interested in patriotism. They had no particular love for native land. Rome to them was anti-Christ. "It was at once their confession and their boast that no interests were more indifferent to them than those of their country."[1] They regarded war and war-making the business of the Roman State, and this business to them was emphatically anti-Christian. This extreme and absolute negation of all patriotism, coupled with an asceticism which drew hundreds of thousands of Christians to a hermit existence in the desert, was a contributing factor to the downfall of the Roman Empire. "The truth is that the religious opinions which prevail in any period are among the symptoms by which that period is marked. When opinions are deeply rooted, they no doubt influence

[1] *History of European Morals,* Lecky, IV.

the conduct of man, but before they can be deeply rooted some intellectual change must first have taken place."[2] Does the Church today believe that it can and ought to work for better international relations? Is the opinion that war is contrary to all religion so deeply rooted in the minds of church members that it influences their conduct?

We are forced to recognize a very large group in the Church today who are teaching that religion is a nebulous something, and the Church is the institution to preserve it, but that to apply it as a dynamic to change society is to destroy it. Karl Barth is the most influential figure in this present trend of religious life in Continental Europe. Since the Nazi revolution his personal standing and influence have probably waned, but his teaching is still a controlling factor over large areas, especially of student life. Barth grew up in a philosophical atmosphere in Switzerland and from his earliest days was immersed in theological and metaphysical speculation. Before the war he accepted Marx and Marxian principles and was a firm believer in the hope that Socialism held out for the salvation of the world. He accepted the Marxian theory of ultimate revolution. Through the catastrophic strife and contending forces he believed there would be brought into existence a new world, based on social justice. Marxian Socialism is thor-

[2] *History of Civilization,* Thomas Buckle, Chapter V.

oughly deterministic. The individual cannot change conditions because the forces operating carry one along just as a mighty river carries its sediment to the sea. Particles of soil have no will of their own in the midst of this onward rush. They have no choice in selecting their environment and no method of changing it. The economic system under which the majority of mankind lives today is producing the seeds of its own destruction. Along with the processes of production under the present governments supported by the capitalist system, there is being generated explosive materials, and these are stored up in every country, in every city, and in every town. Ultimately there will be a crash that will bring down the whole social order and upon its wreck a new and better order of society will be built. This, in outline, is the Marxian doctrine of the "crisis."

There is a strange affinity in thought and general attitude toward life between the fundamentalist in religion and the followers of Karl Marx. The fundamentalist opposes all action for social betterment because it limits the power of God and seems to cast reflection on the character and ability of the Almighty. If He is a good God, why should conditions that He has made require the tinkering of human hands? The world is good and only man is vile. In God's own good time He will bring the present order to an end, will return His Son to the

earth to redeem His own, and will set things right. Therefore, all we need to do, according to the fundamentalist's position, is to "wait on God." Many thinkers have come to recognize this strange parallelism, but whether Barth was conscious of it himself it is difficult to say. At any rate he carries over into his philosophical religious system the ideas learned from Karl Marx. His theory of the "Crisis" and the theology of the "Crisis" is the Marxian principle brought into the theological field. Marx and his followers look for a new heaven and a new earth established here in this world. The proletariat is to come into his own with "human welfare" as his new god. Barth promises that after the smash-up there will be a new heaven and a new earth. What this means is hard to say. God will be absolute ruler over all and recognized as such, but no one can approach this God. In seeking Him it is impossible to find Him. It is only when He condescends to call His creatures into His presence that they can know anything of Him. "Canst thou by searching find out God?" "If I speak of strength, lo, He is strong and if of judgment, who will set me a time to plead?" Job cried out: "If I knew where to find God and how to come into His presence, I would go. He is not a man as I am, that I should answer Him and we should come together in judgment. Neither is there any daysman betwixt us that might lay his hand upon us both." Then

in utter hopelessness he said: "I am afraid of all my sorrows; I know that thou wilt not hold me innocent. If I be wicked why then labor I in vain. If I wash myself with snow water and make my hands never so clean, yet shalt thou plunge me in the ditch and my own clothes shall abhor me."

There is no place for optimism in a system like this. There can be no doubt but what the change in Barth's outlook was brought about by the war and its ugly aftermath. He was twenty-eight years old when the war began and, like millions of others, the insanity of the whole senseless slaughter, followed by the years of blundering diplomacy and the rise of false nationalisms, dressing themselves in hundreds of ugly forms, revolted him and made him see the stupid incompetence of mankind. Gradually he came to believe that there can be no ultimate solution of these human problems if you detach them from the consideration of a life beyond the present and in reaction his mind swung to the opposite extreme.

In the midst of the chaos in which we find ourselves today, men and women everywhere are seeking for some firm foundation upon which they can reconstruct their faith in God and belief in mankind. The increase of crime, the skeptical attitude toward life and all its values, the negation of moral principles which have hitherto been the sign-posts on the road of human existence; all of

these evils have fallen upon us largely because, whether for good or evil, consciously or unconsciously, man "has bowed God out of His own universe." The old demands of righteousness have lost their significance. The imperative word spoken by the God of all the earth is not heard. Having lost touch with the Infinite and cut off life from the source of all life, man vainly seeks to set up new altars and create new gods. Karl Barth is doing a real service when he recalls us to a God of our youth, a God who is after all "behind the veil keeping watch above His own." This message and this emphasis are needed. Sidney Lanier felt this as he wrote:

As the marsh-hen secretly builds on the watery sod,
Behold I will build me a nest on the greatness of God;
I will fly to the greatness of God as the marsh-hen flies
In the freedom that fills all the space twixt the marsh and
the sky.
By so many roots as the marsh grass sends in the sod
I will heartily lay me ahold on the greatness of God.
Oh, like to the greatness of God in the greatness within
The range of the marshes, the liberal marshes of Glynn.[3]

Is it good to throw away all reality and all history in relation to religion? "Religion," says Barth, "must be absolute and stand by itself." Therefore, he discards religion as such and says that all that can remain, all that we have, is faith, and faith be-

[3] *The Marshes of Glynn,* Sidney Lanier, published by Chas. Scribner's Sons.

longs to a realm above the natural and is not yet confirmed or confuted by reason, and so it is not subject to the laws of time and space. His method is not dogmatic; he could never produce systematic theology. The dialectic method is really a progressive question and answer method and by it you never reach an ultimate conclusion. One question develops within another. You live by the dialectic method in a constant condition of philosophical suspense: disbelieving, questioning, groping, failing, falling, and seeking. Revelation is apart from the Bible and the word of God is the word of Revelation. Faith and knowledge have no relationship to each other. Faith, based on reason, is a contradiction in terms. Faith has no relation to temporal affairs and the thing that you accept by faith cannot be proven by logical means. It is not susceptible to proof. Faith he defines as a "leap into the void." It is by means of this faith that we "build a bridge, one end resting on the earth in time; the other reaching out into a vacuum."

This philosophy puts the Christian life and the Church at war with all modern knowledge. It has been aptly said that the one who adopts this attitude toward life is like a man opening a door and looking out upon a world where he sees such horrible sights that he slams the door shut and then crawls back to live in the darkness of the room, thus trying to save his reason, if possible, by shut-

ting out the things he fears will destroy him. There is, however, in this teaching a tenuous connection with the attitude of the early Christians, with the essential difference that the early Christians faced Rome with overwhelming odds against them. They were a slave minority in a huge empire. It was their puny strength against the legions and all their might. The nearest parallel is found in Gandhi and his followers. This insignificant little man with his impractical ideas and his essential teaching that to be strong one must withdraw from the world, because of his influence and his following, is one of the most mighty forces the British Empire has ever had to face in its struggle to hold its vast continents together. Non-cooperation is a terrible weapon and is more effective than all guns and cannons. The early Church did not give ground to a feeling of hopelessness in face of the tremendous odds against it. The early Christians realized that the only method by which they could exist was to change the world. Either Christianity must make the world Christian, or the paganism of the world would destroy Christianity. The figure of the small measure of yeast in a mass of meal was the figure used to represent the early Church. The yeast worked a transformation in the whole mass of meal, making it like itself. If the yeast happened to be faulty it disappeared and became inert as the meal itself.

Nothing could dampen the courage or quench the optimism of the members of the early Church. In spite of this historical precedent, an optimistic view of life is in the words of some considerable number of modern Christians almost a sin. Such philosophy is fundamentally, thoroughly materialistic. It says, in effect: "Conditions are so bad that you can do nothing to remedy them." One is constantly met with opposition to some practical cooperative enterprise for social betterment, or for the establishment of world peace, with the quibble that Christianity is more than "mere humanism" and that if we would be real Christians we must get away from "the optimistic philosophy which has been substituted largely in America for real Christianity."

In a widely quoted article which appeared in *The Student World* the writer protests against what he calls "a mechanized ideology, or the system of religious activity." "No one," says he, "whether within or without, seems to be frightened by the claim implied in such activity. The Kingdom of God is systematically organized as a job. It is a canalization of salvation, a great irrigation system carrying the means of salvation to the uttermost ends of the earth. The ideals, projects, constructions, collaborations and organizations of religious activity imitate the national and international cartels, trusts, and mutual benefit associations

of the economic sphere. The Roman Catholic system of religious activity and its counterpart in neo-Protestant enthusiasm join forces in a common attempt to extend their dominion around the world and to enter the realm of politics. In religious activity an artificial and also secondary creation has arisen which covers up the rest which remains of original creation."[4] Quotations of this kind could be multiplied almost without number. Debates are organized and discussions endlessly carried on by those who represent humanism and those who represent "Christianity pure and undefiled."

A young student in a Scottish university wrote the following parody on William P. Merrill's great hymn, "Rise up, O Men of God."

Sit down, O Men of God!
Have done with greater things!
Cease, heart, and soul, and mind, and strength!
To serve the King of Kings.

Sit down, O Men of God!
His Kingdom He will bring
Whenever it may please His Will;
You cannot do a thing!

Avoid the cross of Christ;
Don't tread where He has trod!
Sit, brothers of the Son of Man,
And leave it all to God!

[4] See *The Student World* (1934), a periodical publication of the World Christian Student Federation, Geneva, Switzerland.

Jesus came to seek and to save the lost. His friends were among the lowliest. "He spake as never man spoke before," but the unlearned, the ignorant, and the beggars and sinners understood Him and flocked about Him. He was misunderstood by the wise. Those who confronted Him with philosophical and metaphysical doubts were set right by practical illustrations which pointed the way of service for humanity. Jesus was a teacher but His teaching was interrupted constantly by His service in behalf of His fellowmen. He came into the world not to glorify God primarily, but to save fallen men and the world itself. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." He was one of the great religious teachers who illustrated His teachings with such simple stories that the people knew exactly what He was trying to say.

The man who fell among thieves on the road to Jericho was rescued by the good Samaritan. Jesus, in the story, did not have the Samaritan go and hunt up a companion and philosophize over the conditions and then run away from his duty. The Samaritan would certainly have had ample excuse to have felt that in determining where his love to his neighbor should begin and end, it was not with the Jew. A young man came to Jesus and said:

"What must I do to inherit eternal life?" Jesus did not give him a hard stone in philosophical abstractions but at once set for him a practical task, and when he sent out his disciples it was to heal, to teach, and to baptize. These disciples were the "feet of the Gospel." "The Kingdom of Heaven," said Jesus, "is as a man traveling to a far country who called his servants and delivered unto them his goods. Unto one he gave five talents; to another two; and to another one; to each according to his several abilities. And straightway took his journey. Then he that had received five talents went and traded with the same and made them into another five talents, and likewise he that had received two talents, he also gained another two, but he that had received one talent went and digged into the earth and hid his lord's money. After a long time the lord of those servants cometh and reckoned with them. To the servant who had made five talents, as well as the one who had gained two, he said, well done." Now suppose Jesus had taken the other viewpoint. Suppose that Christianity is just a philosophical system and that if you apply it, you destroy it. He would have said then to these men who had increased their talents: "You have been enthusiastic and altogether too much interested in worldly affairs; by your zeal and optimistic attitude you indicate that you are no longer entitled to the place of honor." And to the servant who hid his

talent he would have said: "Thou knewest that I reap where I sow not and gather where I have not strewn. Therefore, thou has done well to be quiet and wait until I return to claim my own. Therefore, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

There is without question a fine balance between Christian thought and Christian activity. As we think, so we will be, for thought precedes action and ultimately sets our character. It is well to take our bearings and rechart our course at intervals as we go through life, but if overactivity and an overemphasis on humanism are an admitted danger, we must not fail to give full weight to the danger that grows out of the opposite extreme, and measure at its full value the criticism leveled against religion and the churches that they are strong in rebuke, long on counsel, mighty in argument, but weak when it comes to doing anything practical to change bad conditions into good conditions. The slums in every great Christian city are a standing monument to the failure of the Christian Church. Hunger, want, suffering, and a large part of the sickness that curses mankind are due to the failure of religious people to make their religion effective in the common life of their day and generation. Through activity and intelligent social engineering, coupled with humble and quiet patient trust in God, the Church can meet its obligations. Jesus demanded service. He based the reason for that

service on the conversion of the individual, the transformation of character, so that the disciple of Jesus does what he does and acts as he does because as "a new man in Christ Jesus" he can do no other. It was this compulsion that carried Luther before the Diet of Worms. It is this compulsion that is making the Church strong where it is strong today. Jesus is the way of truth and the light. He stands foremost among those who have pointed out the path to a better life for mankind. His love and its compulsion is one of the strongest forces that can be utilized in eradicating war and bringing about permanent peace. He should be first in the counsel chamber of the nations. If His will and His example and His influence have their way, war will cease.

All the religions have embodied in them the ideals of universal peace, based on the conception of the universality of human need, of human want, and whether we be black, red, yellow, brown, or white, we are all of one blood. We stand shoulder to shoulder. The sorrows of one are the sorrows of all. The world is a unity and this fact was never more clearly demonstrated, or more completely understood, than it is right now. War in one area affects all areas. The simple civil war that began in Spain has grown until today it is not merely civil war, but Spain is the field on which great worldwide forces are fighting out their battle.

What is happening in Spain may happen in almost any other place. We cannot withdraw from the world. We are a part of the world and must make up our minds whether we want to live in the midst of armed camps, or whether we are willing to pay the price, work out the problem, help to adjust our agreements with our neighbors, so that we can get rid of our arms and live as civilized people—human beings—ought to live.

Religious folk and the churches have a great responsibility. How can it be met?

Every church ought to have a Peace Committee as a part of its general organization. The smallest church in the smallest community is, as far as that community and its people are concerned, the center of the universe. Lines go out from that center to the ends of the world. Therefore, every church and every religious group must feel that it is an integral part of the whole human race with all its problems and all its needs. The committee need not be very large. The main thing is that its work shall not be simply perfunctory. A committee of five or seven is large enough in the average church. The committee should be organized for effective work with a chairman and a secretary. Then there should be a very simple but effective program. The carrying out of the program should be recognized as an essential, important and effective part

of the total program of the church. The program may well be based upon these principles:[5]

1. The members of every church should become intelligent as to the relations of the United States to other nations, the conditions under which peace is threatened, and the various efforts now being made to prevent war.
2. Churches must teach that war is a denial of our faith in a God of love and justice.
3. Moral principles must be applied to the economic and racial factors of international relations.
4. Church members should be helped to see the moral dangers involved in international enmities.
5. In case of war the motive of American neutrality should not be selfish isolation but a conservation of resources to serve a suffering world.
6. Churches, as well as individuals, should support intelligent legislation and cooperative efforts intended to prevent war.
7. If nations are to avoid misery they, as well as individuals, must conform to and can be aided by the will of God.

To make effective these principles:

1. The committee in each church should arrange for a monthly meeting for at least eight months of the year. This meeting may well take the form of a study circle. A good idea is for the committee to arrange with some member of the church or group to invite the committee to meet for the discussion in their home. The committee then ar-

[5] Principles adopted at Goodwill Congress, Denver, Colo., Nov. 11, 1936.

ranges the program. The committee should invite personally a limited number to be present. The following letter has been used with good results:

> You are invited to meet at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Jones on the night of May 5th as the guest of the Peace Committee of the First Methodist Church. On that evening we propose to discuss the question of disarmament. We have asked two of our members to read a paper on the subject, "The Present Situation Regarding Arms, Armaments and Preparations for War." We have asked another member to tell what efforts have been made to limit and reduce armaments. There will be a chance for questions, answers, and general debate on the subject. We want you to come and take part.

At another meeting follow the same plan but arrange a debate on some question, perhaps military training in the schools. A long list of subjects can be dealt with in this way, such as the League of Nations, the World Court and others. Occasionally a meeting can be held where the group may discuss problems from the standpoint of the countries themselves. What is the situation in France? What is the situation in Norway; in Sweden; in England? At these meetings it will be possible on special occasions to have some representative present who has returned from a trip to Europe, or maybe one of the members of the Italian or French or German group in the community who can speak from the standpoint of his own people. An ingenious committee can easily arrange programs for eight

meetings during the year. It would be a good thing if every committee would arrange for at least two public demonstrations. The Peace Committee in some churches takes charge of the evening church service for one Sunday night and in other places, in addition to the discussion group as has been outlined, they take charge of one or more of the mid-week meetings so that they bring in a larger group and incidentally bring new vitality into the "prayer meeting." The young people's organization in many churches gives one Sunday evening a month to a discussion of international affairs, the program being arranged by the Peace Committee.

2. The committee should build up a peace library in each church. This should be a regular part of its activities. The literature of the various organizations working for peace, especially those that give facts relating to international affairs and those that tell of what is being done by the organized churches, should be made available to the congregation. Where possible, and it is possible in almost every church, there should be a bulletin board put up either in the social hall or in the vestibule of the church where it will be noticeable, and on this should be tacked items of information relating to international affairs. Some one should be appointed as custodian of the bulletin board. It is amazing the amount of interesting material that will come to the hands of a live committee and how many things

will be found of value, as well as of keen interest to the members of the church and congregation.

3. The committee should recognize as one of its activities the influencing of legislation having to do with international policies. Each committee should write to Washington, to the Secretary of State, to the President, to the Senators, and to the Congressmen who represent it. The first letter that the committee writes should be simply a letter informing the Senators and others that there is such a committee and that they are going to write from time to time expressing their opinion. This committee should furnish the local paper with items and articles and with stories of its own activities in behalf of world peace. When it writes a letter to the Senator, a copy of that letter should be given to the local paper. The committee should have the telephone numbers of all the leading members of the church and others who can be influenced so that if any issue arises where pressure needs to be brought upon Congress, they can immediately call up these people and have them write or telegraph their opinions. The effort to secure the kind of legislation the religious-minded people of the nation want is not decided in Washington, but back in the local community. If we had a thousand communities in the United States, covering the entire country and a hundred people in each one of those communities who would instantly express their

opinion on any matter affecting international relations, it would make all the difference in the world as to how the final congressional vote on any issue was cast.

4. Preaching and crusading for peace should never end as long as war is a menace. No one can exaggerate the difficulties that we face and the need for constant representation. The pastor of any church will be glad to cooperate with the committee in its work.

5. Cooperation. International peace means cooperation on the widest scale. No Peace Committee in any church can do its work satisfactorily if it assumes that it and it alone can do all that it is necessary to do. Therefore, in every community there ought to be the widest kind of cooperation between the various churches and religious organizations.[6] All of those who are working for peace should know each other and know what is being thought and what is being done. It is on the basis of creating a new world community that peace will be finally achieved. To bring in the era of peace we need to enlist the whole community in the work for peace. This should be the end and the purpose of all of our education, of all of our publicity, of all of our preaching, of all of our crusading. A warless world is a united world. A united

[6] See *Religion Renounces War*, Walter Van Kirk, published by Willett, Clark & Co.

world is the aggregate of united cooperating communities. Therefore, there should be established as soon as possible and wherever possible a Community Peace Council and the Peace Committees of the various churches should be among the best, most loyal and effective members.

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE PRICE OF PEACE

WE CAN have peace any time that we are willing to pay the price. We know well enough how peace can be established. We have machinery enough now to prevent war. We have the world community in embryonic form, and it can be readily developed to a place where it will greatly influence, if not control in an orderly, lawful manner, all international actions of the nations. We have machinery for arbitration, for conciliation, for the adjustment of all our disputes. Whatever additional machinery is necessary can be quickly supplied. The technicians have done their work well. There is plenty of knowledge. Sufficient surveys have been made so that all the world knows what the facts are and where the difficulties lie. We need a realistic approach to this subject. We need a program that is firmly based upon facts, a program that can be realized. But after we have considered the meaning of realism, have sifted out the false from the true, have come to realize how much selfishness and the rule of "safety first" is embodied in the statement "let's be realistic," we

are even then not at the end of the road. The final question that we ask is this: Are we willing to pay the price?

The reason that peace machinery is ineffective and war threatens is because the nations are not willing to act up to the level of their intelligence. Every international conference that has been held has focused the hopes of the world upon the efforts of statesmen. In effect, the people around the world have said time and time again, "at last the nations realize that they must do everything possible to establish peace." No one can ever forget the feeling of satisfaction that animated Europe when the Locarno Accord was announced. Another wave of hope swept across the world when the Briand-Kellogg Pact was formally signed in Paris. It looked for awhile as if there was a sincere desire and a real purpose to accomplish the things for which the ages had waited. But as time moved on, political interests outweighed human needs. The commissions of experts, technicians of war, and other authorities weighing the fine possibilities of effectiveness as between various weapons and their uses have adjourned every conference that has been held with exceedingly small results to show for the labors of the world's best statesmen.

How easy it is to point out difficulties. Take the question of disarmament, which, after all, is the crux of the whole question of peace and war. The

technicians who find difficulty in working out a plan of disarmament for their own nations are the same ones who in 1918 had no difficulty in disarming Germany and her allies. These men laid down rules for the guidance of Germany that made it impossible, if followed, for her to become an aggressive force in the world, leaving her merely enough instruments to act as a police force for maintaining internal order. But these same technicians found that the chickens hatched out at Versailles began to come home to roost. When their own nations were involved they said, "No, it can't be done." It can't be done? Certainly it can't be done, simply because the nations who wanted to neutralize the effectiveness of their enemies as a war menace are unwilling to pay the price to put themselves in the same position.

On the question of disarmament we find that it is fear and a lack of trust in their neighbors that make the nations unwilling to pay the price. It is, however, not always these intangibles that decide the issue. It is also sheer greed of gain. For instance, when the nations in the League were struggling to settle the dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay a story was published, and could not be denied, that the nations laboring to settle the dispute were themselves, through their nationals, selling war materials to both Bolivia and Paraguay, thus enabling the belligerents to continue the war. America was at

that time using her good offices to effect a settlement. According to the best reports available in Geneva, while America was acting as special arbitrator, munitions makers in the United States sold upwards of a million dollars worth of arms and munitions to both of the belligerent powers in one year, and England, not to be outdone, sold twice that amount during the same period. It is difficult to check these figures but their substantial correctness can be easily ascertained. The same thing was true in regard to the war in Manchuria. In addition to the fear of Japan as a war power was the fear of overtoppling the fine balance of power that blocked the action of the nations. I talked with one of the men responsible for dealing with Japan in that situation. He was doubtful as to the practicability of making effective the Stimson proposal that no nation should recognize territory gained by any Power through aggression. "Why?" I asked. And he replied: "Take the question of Manchuria. There are big British and American interests in that area. It is going to be developed. Japan is the most efficient government in the Far East and she is just at the beginning of her development. Do we want to tie our hands as to the future and ruin our trade with a great territory by advocating a principle that while theoretically good and based on high moral ideals is not the kind of thing upon which you can found the procedure of modern

states?" I quoted this opinion to a number of men, and I found that while no one questioned the moral validity of the "Stimson doctrine," no practical statesman believes that we ought to put too much emphasis upon it because our own nation in some particular crisis may find that the doctrine acts as a boomerang. The question of oil was the deciding factor in the Italian-Ethiopian controversy.

If the nations want peace, each must be willing to sacrifice a part of its sovereignty. By sovereignty is meant that the nation has the right to do as it pleases. We do not accord to an individual any such right or privilege. Why then give this right to a nation? The man who says, "I defy the community to restrict my free action" writes himself down as a public enemy. We are all at liberty as individuals to do anything that does not limit the liberty of other people to do the same thing. Walt Whitman said, putting it in a negative way:

I speak the password primeval, I give the sign of democracy,
By God! I will accept nothing which all cannot have their counterpart of on the same terms.[1]

Extreme nationalism is anarchy written in large letters, and out of it grow clashes of interests and wars. The League of Nations need not be a superstate, but for the peace of the world the nations must be willing to enter the League—even the

[1] "Song of Myself," Sec. 24, Walt Whitman.

United States Government itself—and give up some of their prerogatives and their rights. Are we willing to pay the price?

Nations find difficulty in supporting sincere efforts to establish peace because they hold to an old and outworn code of honor. The Foreign Secretary of a nation says: "The honor and vital interests of my nation will not permit me to reveal the number of men and guns we possess. Anyway this is our own affair. This belongs to us alone." A nation issues a statement and no matter whether it is true or not, after it has once been issued, then the nation must stand by that statement. To recede from it shows weakness. National prestige demands that each nation "gain face" and if found in fault must "save face" if possible. Any concession made must be such as will not put the nation at a disadvantage in the opinion of its neighbors. This is childish and proves that extreme nationalism is more a "children's disease" than anything else. But it is deadly contagious and a constant danger to the world community.

In building up the local community when men righted their own wrongs, carried swords at their sides, or pistols in their pockets, their honor was no more precious to them than the honor of the ordinary good citizen of today, but we heard a lot more about it, and it seemed to be such a frail thing that it was always being nipped by the frost

of public criticism. Finally we came to the conclusion that the peace of the community is greater than the prestige of any swashbuckler who feels that he must make a name for himself in the public streets of our cities.

I sat beside a statesman one day in Geneva during a tense meeting of the League of Nations. It seemed that the whole show would be broken up. "Why," I said to him, "are we in the midst of this impasse?" "It is simply," he replied, "because the nations involved are not willing to do as well as they know how to do." In other words, they had the information, they knew that it would be to their advantage to adjust their difficulties, but they were unable to bring themselves to pay the cost. Fear of their neighbors, fear of one thing and another, and above all the stark idea that they might be put at a disadvantage with the other nations. They lacked faith, confidence and courage to do what they knew to be the right thing. So we saw the nations of the world, through their representatives, sitting paralyzed, hag-ridden every one of them by what would happen if they ventured beyond the well-trodden paths that they know have always led to bloodshed and disaster. When war comes, however, we all pay the cost, and we know that we must pay the cost. Everything goes into war. The nation, in order to win, will not let

honor, truth, morality, virtue or anything else stand in the way.

National security, national prestige, national honor are all relative, and not one of them is worth saving if it has to be saved at the expense of world peace. No true honor, no true prestige can be lost by helping to free the world from war. All other values are fictitious.

Does civilization intend to commit suicide? None of the great Powers are as greatly exercised over these problems as are the smaller nations. Where is any security for any small nation if a strong Power can come in and despoil it and its lands, disrupt its government, and alienate its territory? The great Powers stand helpless, for behind every nation there is the menace of revolution. Some time ago two thousand people, many laboring men, most of them Communists, gathered in Amsterdam in a huge protest against war. In Paris a little bit later the same groups met and filled one of the largest halls in the city while fifteen thousand people outside clamored to get in. Last year five thousand people, representing all types of thought and conditions of men from the various countries of the world, met in Brussels in a great demonstration against war. The common people are aroused as never before. These conferences and demonstrations are but surface indications of that worldwide and deep-seated resentment against the ineffective-

ness of government and the hypocrisy of foreign offices while over the homes of the people there hovers the daily menace of war. The churches are hesitant and high Church leaders are bewildered by confused national counsels. What can be done to organize public opinion and stir the nations so that they will go over all the lesser issues and come face to face with this one problem that now menaces the future of mankind?

We know how peace can be secured. Is it not time to quit talking about wanting peace and working for peace unless we are willing to pay the price that is demanded in order that we may have a peaceful world? The answer to this will probably be the sickening formula that we have heard so often in Geneva in the Council of the League of Nations and in other great international gatherings where the nations, through their representatives, are presumably trying to find a way of settling disputes different from the old way of war. "Of course," they say, "my government accepts this obligation, but, mind you, only in principle." If there is any sanity left among men and nations, they must do away with the instruments of war and establish the means for carrying out methods of a peaceful solution of their difficulties. To fail is to condemn civilization to death and abandon the world to chaos.

APPENDICES

I. List of Principal International Conferences held since signing of Armistice, Nov. 11, 1918.

II. The American Proposals put forward at the Geneva Peace Conference.

III. Comparative Table of Armed strength of the nations.

(1) Armies—1920-21

(2) Armies—1935

IV. Amount spent by U. S. A. on army and navy (by years), 1919-1936.

V. Comparative Table of Armaments of United States, Great Britain and Japan (1921-1926-1936).

VI. Comparative Naval Forces Great Britain, United States and Japan (1921-1926-1936).

VII. Naval strength of the United States as of 1936.

VIII. Bibliography.

I

LIST OF PRINCIPAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES HELD SINCE SIGNING OF ARMISTICE, NOV. 11, 1918

1. *The Versailles Conference—1919*

The Versailles Conference ended in signing of the Treaty of Versailles, between the Allied and Associated Powers, and the Central Powers. The Treaty was signed June 28, 1919, and came into effect January 10, 1920.

Treaty reduced German army to 100,000 soldiers, deprived her of naval forces, forced renunciation of 13% of her European territory and all of her African colonies and Islands in the Pacific, imposed indemnity, required denunciation of treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest and sanctioned authority for an Inter-Allied Commission of Control.

The Covenant of the League of Nations was made part of the Treaty.

The United States made separate treaties with Germany, Austria, and Hungary, November 18, 1921.

2. *Conference at Sévres—1920*

The purpose of the Sévres Conference was to draw up a Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Turkey.

Resulted in Treaty entering into international settle-

ment over reparations with Germany. Demilitarized Dardanelles area. The Treaty was never ratified and was later superseded by the Lausanne Treaty.

3. *The Washington Naval Conference 1921-1922*

Purpose: To bring about a limitation of armaments, and to settle problems in the Far East.

Results: United States, Great Britain, Japan scrapped 68 capital ships.

Declared ten-year holiday on battleships.

Limited size aircraft carriers.

Failed to limit: cruisers, submarines, destroyers.

Treaties resulting from Conference:

(1) Nine-Power Treaty

(2) Four-Power Pacific Pact—Great Britain, United States, France, Japan

(3) Five-Power Treaty for Limitation of Naval Armaments, Feb. 6, 1922 (5-5-3 ratio, Great Britain, United States, Japan). Treaty was signed by Great Britain, France, Japan, United States, Italy.

4. *Lausanne Conference—November 20, 1922, to July 24, 1923*

Origin: On September 23, 1933, the principal Allied Powers invited the Angora Government (the Government in power at close of Graeco-Turkish war) to a peace conference on the two bases:

(a) Restoration of Turkish sovereignty over Constantinople and Thrace up to the line of the river Maritsa.

(b) Exclusion pending the final settlement of Turkish military forces and Thrace, and respect by

the Turks for certain zones adjoining the Straits which the Allied authorities had declared neutral during the Graeco-Turkish conflict.

The Angora Government accepted the invitation, and proposed a preliminary Armistice Conference which met on October 3, and resulted in the Lausanne Conference in November.

Results: Turkey recovered everything which she had possessed in 1914, with exception of former Arab provinces of Asiatic Turkey, which had been mandated to France and Great Britain. No restrictions were imposed on the Turkish naval and military forces, and no control was asserted by the Allies over Turkish finance.

The Dardanelles Area was demilitarized.

Treaty was signed, Jan. 30, 1923, for protection of religious minorities in Greece and Turkey.

Also resulted in Treaty entering into international settlement over reparations with Germany. (See Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th Ed., Volume 20.)

5. *Locarno Conference–October 5-16, 1925*

Purpose: To seek an agreement for preserving from war the nations whose representatives met at Lacarno, namely Germany, Belgium, Great Britain, France, Italy, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Resulted in agreements by France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium and Czechoslovakia. Existing French frontier guaranteed and mutual pledges given all the participating powers to secure peace in Western Europe.

Germany, France and Belgium renounced use of military force in relations to one another.

6. Geneva Naval Conference, convened, June 21, 1927

Members: United States, Great Britain, Japan, Italy and France.

Origin: The five chief naval powers met in conference in Washington during the winter of 1921-22 and agreed upon the reduction and limitation of their battleships and battle-cruisers. President Coolidge invited the conference to reassemble at Geneva.

Purpose: To carry on the work of the Washington Conference and to reduce and limit agencies of naval warfare, other than battleships and battle-cruisers; such as, cruisers of 10,000 tons displacement, submarines, hydroplane-carriers and hydroplanes.

Result: The Conference ended in failure. Great Britain and the United States could not agree on question of cruiser tonnage.

7. Conference for Signing of General Pact for the Renunciation of War

This pact, otherwise known as the Kellogg-Briand Pact, was signed at Paris, France, August 27, 1928, by 15 nations outlawing war as an instrument of national policy. Signatory nations have since grown to 59.

The two articles of the pact are as follows:

"*Article I:* The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

"*Article II:* The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which

may arise among them shall never be sought except by pacific means."

8. *London Naval Conference—1930*

Participating Nations: Great Britain, United States, Japan, France, Italy.

Purpose: Reduction and limitation of armaments.

Results: Three-Power Naval Treaty signed by Great Britain, United States, and Japan. France and Italy, the other powers, did not sign agreement.

Battleship holiday until 1936 declared.

Great Britain agreed to parity with United States.

Treaty expired January 1, 1937.

9. *World Disarmament Conference—Geneva, February, 1932*

Purpose: An effort to draft an international treaty for the reduction and limitation of armaments as a result of the years of work by the Preparatory Disarmament Commission of the League of Nations.

After four years of work, the Conference collapsed without achieving its purpose.

10. *The World Economic Conference—London, June 12, 1933*

Purpose: To adjust outstanding economic, commercial and monetary questions fundamental to the life of each nation and to the nations in their relations with each other.

The Conference ended in failure.

11. *Seventh Pan-American Conference, Montevideo, December, 1933*

Made an effort to settle the Chaco question.

Urged signing by all of the members of both North

and South America of the five peace treaties: the Kellogg Pact, two Washington Treaties, the Treaty of Buenos Aires, the Gondra Treaty. These have not been signed to date, but have been submitted to the respective governments for ratification. United States declared policy not to intervene by military intervention in Latin American affairs. Declared question of tariffs between North and South America be settled in future on an international basis.

12. *London Naval Conference, 1935-36*

Purpose: To prepare for the Conference of 1936, the time of the expiration of the Washington Treaty signed in 1922.

Results: Treaty signed by Great Britain, France and the United States, March 25, 1936. Treaty expires at end of 1942.

Holiday on 10,000-ton cruisers.

Reduction in size of aircraft carriers from 27,000 to 23,000 tons.

Annual exchange of information regarding naval building programs.

The Conference failed in its effort to effectuate a satisfactory limitation, to say nothing of a satisfactory reduction of armaments.

Japan denounced the Washington Treaty and withdrew from the London Naval Conference. The 5-5-3 naval ratio was abrogated.

13. *Pan-American Conference at Buenos Aires—Dec. 2, 1936*

Things achieved:[1]

A neutrality convention that obligates all the Amer-

[1] *New York Times*, Dec. 20, 1936.

ican nations to adopt a common joint attitude as neutrals in case of war in the Americas.

A convention providing for the interchange of professors and students among all the American countries.

A convention by which the signatory States agree to teach peace in school texts.

A convention on the interchange of publications.

A convention facilitating the interchange of educational motion-picture films.

A convention facilitating art exhibits in all American countries.

A resolution postponing consideration of the proposed American League of Nations to the eighth Pan-American conference in Lima, Peru, in 1938.

A resolution of homage to international lawyers who have been working on the codification of American international law.

A resolution recommending that all governments extend to women all the rights and duties of citizenship.

A resolution urging the Pan-American Union to give preferential attention to topics relating to intellectual cooperation, particularly for "moral disarmament," in preparing programs for future conferences.

A resolution recommending the revision of school texts to eliminate matter offensive to other American countries.

A resolution urging the elimination of matter offensive to other countries or glorifying war from theatrical productions and motion-picture films.

Four resolutions on the exchange of books, magazines, newspapers, etc.

Three resolutions regarding radio transmission.

Four resolutions regarding writers and newspapers.

II

THE AMERICAN PROPOSALS PUT FORWARD AT THE GENEVA PEACE CONFERENCE

On June 22, 1932, President Hoover submitted to the World Disarmament Conference at Geneva, through Ambassador Gibson, a plan containing the following principles:

1. The Briand-Kellogg Pact means that the nations have agreed to use their arms solely for defence.
2. Reduction should be carried out not only by broad general cuts in armaments, but by increasing the comparative power of defence through decreasing the power of attack.
3. Relativity between armaments should be preserved in making reductions.
4. Reductions must be positive and effect economic relief.
5. Land, air and naval forces are interconnected; and no part of the proposals put forward can be dissociated from the others.

On the basis of these principles, President Hoover proposed that armaments in the world should be reduced by nearly one-third. As to classes of armaments, he made various specific applications of his principles:

1. Abolition of all tanks, all chemical warfare, and all large mobile guns.

2. Reduction of one-third in the strength of all land armies over and above the police component.
3. Abolition of all bombing airplanes, coupled with total prohibition of all bombardment from the air.
4. Reduction in the treaty number and tonnage of battleships by one-third; in the treaty tonnage of aircraft carriers, cruisers and destroyers by one-fourth; and in the treaty tonnage of submarines by one-third, with a provision that no nation should retain a total greater than 35,000 tons.

(See The Year Book of the Disarmament Information Committee, 1932.)

On May 15, 1933, President Roosevelt outlined a plan for reduction of armaments and submitted it to the World Disarmament Conference. The main objects of his proposal were as follows:

1. Ultimate elimination of all offensive weapons. He urged as an immediate purpose a substantial reduction of some of these weapons and the elimination of many others.
2. That the immediate reduction of aggressive weapons be considered as a first step only toward the ultimate goal.
3. No nation to increase its existing armaments over and above the limitations of treaty obligations.
4. Concurrent with and wholly dependent upon the faithful fulfillment of the above proposals and subject to existing treaty rights, he proposed that all the nations of the world enter into a solemn and definite pact of non-aggression.

III

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF ARMS OF THE NATIONS

(1) ARMED STRENGTH OF THE NATIONS

1920–1921

(See *World Almanac*, 1921, p. 373)

Nation	Army	Res. Inc. Militia	Total
China	180,000	.....	180,000
France	350,000	3,000,000	3,350,000
German Republic	100,000	.....	100,000
Great Britain	300,000	.....	300,000
Italy	250,000	1,250,000	1,500,000
Japan	600,000	1,500,000	2,100,000
Russian Republic	600,000	700,000	1,300,000
United States	280,000	.....	280,000

(2) ARMED STRENGTH OF THE NATIONS

1935

(See *World Almanac*, 1936, p. 938)

Nation	Active	Trained Reserve	Sep. Air Force	Total
Belgium	67,848	496,000	.....	563,848
China	2,000,000	.....	.....	2,000,000
Czechoslovakia	137,100	1,489,000	.....	1,626,100
France	564,608	*6,347,200	40,275	6,952,083
Germany	300,000	2,200,000	*60,000	2,560,000
Hungary	36,000	.....	.....	36,000
Italy	433,625	5,885,000	*165,545	6,484,170
Japan	248,000	2,062,000	.....	2,310,000
Poland	324,665	1,721,579	.....	2,046,244
Russia	841,400	15.16M	In Army 45.000	16.00M
Turkey	133,000	532,800	.....	665,800
Yugoslavia	141,836	1,554,793	.....	1,696,629
United States	137,974	298,131	.....	436,105
British Empire	471,602	763,650	47,617	1,282,869
Great Britain	228,362	350,986	45,626	624,974
Australia	1,677	35,000	1,199	37,876
Canada	4,644	51,873	694	57,211
India	228,288	113,048	.....	341,336
I.F.S.	6,496	31,558	.....	38,054
N. Zealand	350	10,368	152	10,870
S. Africa	1,785	170,817	.....	172,602

(Under Russia, the trained reserve and total organized force is given in millions and decimal parts.) (* Estimate)

IV

AMOUNT SPENT BY THE UNITED STATES ON ARMY AND NAVY

Year	Army	Navy	Total
1919.....	$8,995,880,266	$2,002,310,785	$10,998,191,051
1925.....	361,887,889	346,142,001	708,029,890
1929.....	416,901,546	364,561,544	781,463,090
1932.....	468,226,845	357,820,860	826,047,705
1934.....	287,697,260	274,388,386	562,085,646
1935.....	269,433,582	321,410,530	600,844,112
1936.....	364,500,000	639,000,000	1,003,500,000

(Figures for 1919–1935 taken from the *World Almanac*, 1936.)

(Figures for 1936 taken from *Peace Action* for December, 1935. Published by National Council for Prevention of War, Washington, D. C.)

V

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF ARMAMENTS OF UNITED STATES, GREAT BRITAIN, JAPAN

MILITARY FORCES 1920–1921

(See *World Almanac* 1921, p. 373)

Nation	Army	Res. Including Militia	Total
Great Britain.....	300,000	.....	300,000
Japan.....	600,000	1,500,000	2,100,000
United States.....	280,000	.....	280,000

Nation	Active	*1926* (See *World Almanac*, 1926, p. 251)		Total Military Man Power
		Organized Reserves	Unorganized Reserves	
Great Britain..	*152,626	207,143	99,000	5,934,000
Japan.....	210,000	1,503,000	461,000	7,130,000
United States..	138,236	253,821	11,607,943	12,000,000

MILITARY FORCES 1920–1921—(*Continued*)

Nation	Active	*1936* (See *World Almanac*, 1936, p. 938)		Total
		Trained Reserve	Sep. Air Force	
Great Britain..	228,362	350,986	45,626	624,974
Japan.....	248,000	2,062,000	.....	2,310,000
United States..	137,974	298,131	.....	436,105

* British Colonial Units outside of India.

VI

NAVAL FORCES

JANUARY 1, 1921

(See *World Almanac*, 1921, p. 378)

Type of Vessel	Great Britain		United States		Japan	
	No.	Tons	No.	Tons	No.	Tons
Battleships.....	46	962,750	33	707,990	11	244,800
Battle Cruisers..	10	307,500	..	.....	4	110,100
Cruisers.....	21	248,900	19	161,750	9	81,783
Light Cruisers...	87	393,100	..	.....	8	32,790
Coast Defence..	31	108,045	4	12,900	7	78,166
Flotilla leader...	28	48,342	..	.....	..	.....
Destroyers.....	386	400,960	215	244,946	65	51,175
Torpedo boats..	30	8,460	..	.....	9	1,248
Submarines.....	185	139,270	107	.....	17	6,200
Aircraft carriers.	6	90,400	..	.....	1	7,600
TOTAL.....	830	2,707,727	378	1,127,586	131	613,862

NAVAL FORCES—(*Continued*)

Building and Projected

Battleships.....	..	.....	10	389,600	(4 (4	128,000 (?)
Battle cruisers..	..	.....	6	211,800	(4 (4	160,000 (?)
Cruisers.....	..	.....	..	.....	..	.....
Light Cruisers...	..	.....	10	71,000	(9 (12	49,500 (?)
Coast Defence..	..	.....	..	.....	..	.....
Destroyers.....	..	.....	115	139,664	(56	(?)
Submarines.....	..	.....	59	.....	(18 (28	18,900 (?)
Aircraft carriers.	..	.....	1	19,250	..	.....

JANUARY 1, 1926

(See League of Nations Disarmament Yearbook)

1926

Nation	Total Tonnage
Great Britain and Ireland.....	1,342,100 tons
Japan.....	745,492 "
United States.....	1,275,382 "

JANUARY 1, 1936

(See *World Almanac*, 1936, p. 946)

British Empire

Type of Vessel	Total Built (In Tons)	Total Built Under Age	Building and Appropriated for	Additional Permitted by Treaty to be Laid Down Before Dec. 31, '36.
Capital ships....	474,750	381,450	.....	.....
Aircraft carriers..	115,350	115,350	22,000	12,100
Cruisers (A).....	183,396	163,600	.....	.....
Cruisers (B).....	183,480	91,360	96,400	28,290
Destroyers.....	199,229	80,014	36,715	39,396
Submarines.....	56,879	45,624	10,235	4,081
Totals.....	1,213,084	877,398	165,350	83,867

Grand Total—2,339,699 tons

Japan

Capital ships...	272,070	154,750	.....	.....
Aircraft carriers.	68,370	68,370	20,050	50
Cruisers (A).....	123,520	107,800	.....	.....
Cruisers (B).....	110,375	91,995	34,000	.....
Destroyers.....	123,313	85,443	28,957	1500
Submarines.....	72,349	62,431	13,700	528
Totals.....	769,997	570,789	96,707	2078

Grand Total—1,439,571 tons

VII

NAVAL FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES AS OF 1936

Type of Vessel	Total Built (In Tons)	Total Built Under Age	Building and Appro-priated for	Additional Permitted by Treaty to be Laid Down Before Dec. 31. '36.
Capital ships....	464,300	384,200	.....	.....
Aircraft carriers..	92,000	80,500	54,500	.....
Cruisers (A).....	149,775	142,425	30,000	.....
Cruisers (B).....	70,500	70,500	90,000	.....
Destroyers.....	241,105	11,075	84,050	51,975
Submarines.....	70,020	42,210	21,900	18,860
Totals.....	1,087,700	730,910	280,450	70,835

GRAND TOTAL—2,169,895 tons

VIII

BIBLIOGRAPHY

America Must Choose, Henry A. Wallace. Foreign Policy Assn., N. Y.

Essays on Nationalism, Carlton J. H. Hayes. Macmillan Co., N. Y.

Nationalism: Man's Other Religion, Edward Shillito. Willett, Clark, Chicago.

Preachers Present Arms, Ray H. Abrams. Round Table Press, N. Y.

Religion Renounces War, Walter W. Van Kirk. Willett, Clark, Chicago.

Ordeal of Western Religion, Paul Hutchinson. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.

Christianity Confronts Communism, Matthew Spinka. Harper & Brothers, N. Y.

Economics and Peace: A Primer and a Program. National Peace Conference, N. Y.

Man the Unknown, Alexis Carrel. Harper & Brothers, N. Y.

On the Rim of the Abyss, James T. Shotwell. Macmillan Co., N. Y.

War and Peace, Vol. I. The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, edited by Ray Stannard Baker and Wm. E. Dodd. Harper & Brothers, N. Y.

The Great Galilean Returns, Henry K. Booth. Scribner's, N. Y.

La Route des Indes, Paul Morand. Librarie Plon, Paris.
The Problem of the 20th Century, Lord Davies. Ernest Benn Ltd., London.
The Demand for Colonies, Lionel Birch. British League of Nations Union.
What Are You Going to Do About It? The Case for Constructive Peace, Aldous Huxley. British League of Nations Assn.
Sawdust Caesar, George Seldes. Arthur Barker Ltd., London.
America Must Act, Francis B. Sayre. National Peace Conference, N. Y.
The Cotton South and American Trade Policy, Peter Molyneaux. National Peace Conference, N. Y.
History of European Morals, by Lecky.
History of Civilization, Thomas Buckle.
Song of Myself, Walt Whitman.
Press Release of Dept. of State, U. S. A. May 27, 1933.
Social Services of the League of Nations, Pittman B. Potter. Geneva Special Studies, Vol. VI, No. 9, 1935, Geneva Research Center.
Sanctions. International Peace Series No. 12. Church Peace Union, N. Y.
Speech of Sir Samuel Hoare, Record of League Assembly, 1935.
An International Air Force. The New Commonwealth, Mowbray House, Norfolk St., London.
Suicide or Sanity, David Davies. The New Commonwealth, Mowbray House, Norfolk St., London.
Article by Sir Norman Angell, *The Spectator*, Sept. 20, 1935.
Manifesto Against War. Church Peace Union, N. Y.
The Marshes of Glynn, Sidney Lanier. Scribner's, N. Y.

The Student World, 1934, World Christian Student Federation, Geneva.

What is Religion Doing to Stop War? Major General John F. O'Ryan. International Peace Series, No. 13. World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, N. Y.

Foreign Trade and Domestic Welfare. National Foreign Trade Assn., N. Y.

Raw Materials and Colonies. Royal Institute of International Affairs.

The International Distribution of Raw Materials, John C. De Wilde. Geneva Special Studies, Vol. 11, No. 5, Geneva Research Center.

The Farmers' Stake in World Peace, Donald C. Blaisdell. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, N. Y.

Sanctions and Security, Pittman B. Potter. Geneva Special Studies, Vol. III, No. 2, Geneva Research Center.

American Cooperation with the League of Nations. Geneva Special Studies, Vol. I, No. 4, Geneva Research Center.

The Covenant and the Pact. Geneva Special Studies, Vol. I, No. 9, Geneva Research Center.

The League and Economic Reconstruction, C. C. McIvor. Geneva Special Studies, Vol. III, No. 6, Geneva Research Center.

Le Pact de Paris. Briand-Kellogg. Union Mondiale de la Femme, Geneva.

Church, Community and State a World Issue, J. H. Oldham. Student Christian Movement, London.

The Munitions Business; a Drama with full directions for staging, based on the official testimony. Arranged by Paul Harris, Jr. National Council for Prevention of War, Washington.

The Peace Ballot (in Great Britain), Victor Gollancz Ltd. London.

A B C of the Peace Movement, dates and facts, Anna T. Nilsson. International League of Youth, Geneva.

Iron, Blood and Profits, George Seldes. Harper & Brothers, N. Y.

Economics and Peace. National Peace Conference, N. Y.

Raw Materials, Population Pressure and War, Norman Angell. National Peace Conference, N. Y.

The Air Menace and the Answer, Elvira K. Fradkin. Macmillan Co., N. Y.

Religion in the Third Reich. Foreign Policy Reports, Vol. II, No. 24, Jan. 29, 1936, Foreign Policy Assn., N. Y.

Imperialist Rivals in Ethiopia. Foreign Policy Reports, Vol. II, No. 14, Sept. 11, 1935. Foreign Policy Assn., N. Y.

War Tomorrow—Will We Keep Out? Foreign Policy Assn., N. Y.

War as an Instrument of National Policy, James T. Shotwell. Harcourt, Brace & Co.

The Causes of War, edited by Arthur Porritt. World Conference for International Peace through Religion Series. Macmillan Co., N. Y.

The Devil Theory of War, Charles A. Beard. The Vanguard Press, N. Y.

Creative Christianity, Shailer Mathews. Cokesbury Press, Nashville.

The Churches Can Make the Armistice a Permanent Peace. Pamphlet by Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham. Published by World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, N. Y.

Disarmament, Salvador de Madariaga. Coward McCann, N. Y.

Disarmament, Prof. P. J. Noel Baker. Hogarth Press, London.

The World Court, Bustamante. Macmillan Co., N. Y.

U. S. Naval Policy. General Board No. 420-2, Serial No. 1569, approved by Secretary of the Navy, Navy Dept., Washington.

The Price of Peace. Lecture at Oxford by Salvador de Madariaga.

Study Outline, The Causes of War. World Conference for International Peace through Religion, N. Y.

Education for Peace. Publication of the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations, Geneva.

The World's Religions Against War. Proceedings of World Conference for International Peace Through Religion, Geneva, 1928. Je Sers Press, Clamart, France. Church Peace Union, N. Y.

The Place of World Literature in International Relations. Institute of International Relations, Riverside, Calif., 1928, pp. 165-67.

The Cinema in International Education. Education Screen, Chicago, Dec., 1926, Vol. 5, pp. 581-84.

World Friendship Lessons: Many Gifts, Many People. Church Peace Union, N. Y.

Cultural Interchange Between the Americas. Pan-American Magazine, Oct., 1929.

War, Its Cause and Cure, Kirby Page. Geo. H. Durand & Co., N. Y.

Inside Europe, John Gunther, Harper & Brothers.

The Great Alternative to War, Leyton Richards. Macmillan Co., N. Y.

Development of the League of Nations Idea, Theodore Marburg. Macmillan Co., N. Y.

The United States in World Affairs, Walter Lippmann and Wm. O. Scroggs. Harper & Brothers.

The Path to Peace, Nicholas Murray Butler. Scribner's, N. Y.

INDEX

Admiralty, British, 46
Africa, colonization of, 114-115
Aggression, defined, 39
Allies, disarmament of Germany, 33-34
Aloisi, Baron, 64
Angell, Norman, 118
Armaments, not a safeguard, 32-33
Autocracy, 128

Barth, Karl, 161, 165
  "Crisis" theology, 163-164
  dialectic method of, 165-167
Benes, 40, 60, 61
Birth rate, Germany, 120
  Italy, 115
Blanton, Representative, 154
Bliss, General Tasker H., 4
"Blood purge," 132
Bolivia, 183
Booth, Henry K., 87n
Borah, William, 153-154
Boston police strike, 84-85
Briand-Kellogg Pact, 31, 47-48, 71, 80, 143, 182
Bryan, William Jennings, 62
Butler, Major General Smedley D., 4
Butler, Nicholas Murray, 134

Cabot, Richard, 3
Cecil, Viscount Robert, 37
Chamberlain, Neville, 29
Child labor, 13-14
Child Labor Law, 11
China, 67, 108
  integrity guaranteed, 45
Church, 159-161
  as a force, 10
  early days of, 167
  loyalties, 141-142
  relationship to State, 129-130
  responsibility of, for peace, 3-5
Churchill, Winston, 29
Collective security, 13
Colonies, 113-114, 117-118
  reason why desired, 119-120
Communism, 8-9, 134
Confessional Synod, 159-160
Coolidge, Calvin, 84, 85

Davis, Norman, 59-60
Decatur, Stephen, 62
de Madariaga, 60
Democracy, 128, 134
Dictatorship, impermanence of, 132
Disarmament, 13, 25
  acceptance of definite propositions, 40
  as a price of peace, 182-183
  Briand-Kellogg Pact, 47-48
  complexity of the problem, 32
  dependent on development of World Community, 35
  League founded to promote, 33-34
  peace established through, 33
  reason for failure of conferences on, 34

Disarmament—(*Continued*)
Washington Naval Conference, 45
See also Disarmament Conference
Disarmament Conference, 26, 27 45-46, 49 ff.
clash between Germany and France, 60
Davis, Norman, 59-60
dominated by fear, 57
"Draft Convention," 42, 53
French proposal, 56
Gibson, Hugh, 58
Henderson, Arthur, 52-53
Litvinoff, Maxim, 55, 58-59
Preparatory Commission, 41-42
problems encountered, 54 ff.
reason for failure, 61
results, 60-61
Simon, Sir John, 57
Stimson, Henry, 58, 59
withdrawal of Germany, 60
"Draft Convention," general provisions of, 53
"Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance," 38

Education, 143 ff
activity in behalf of peace in the United States, 148-151
a realistic approach to, 157
for peace, by churches, 155-156
Nazi Youth Movement, 146-147
responsibility of the churches, 155
under dictatorships, 147-148
Einstein, 17
Ethiopia, 13, 68, 93, 94, 95, 99, 107, 115

Fascism, 132, 134
demonstration of, at Geneva, 28
Folkstum, 119
Four Power Pact, 45
France, 25, 69
clash with Germany at Disarmament Conference, 60
dealings with Italy, 99-100
rebuilds defenses, 26
Fuller, General, 104

Gandhi, 167
Garvin, J. L., 27
Geneva Protocol, 40
provisions of, 39
Germany, 29, 34, 42, 70, 110
anti-Jewish campaign, 133
clash with France at Disarmament Conference, 60
Confessional Synod, 159-160
cost of rearmament of, 29
demands "equality of treatment," 26
disarmed at Versailles, 33
exports, 121
limitation of population, 120
Nazi purge, 132
Nazi Youth Movement, 146-147
need of raw materials, 110, 111-112
possible courses of action to procure food, 112 ff.
pre-war population of colonies, 117
reason for desire for colonies, 119-120
reenters Rhineland, 27
resigns from League, 60
return of colonies, 113-114
Gibson, Hugh, 58
Gompers, Samuel, 84

Great Britain, as the opponent of Italy, 99
enters the race for supremacy, 28
hesitancy in attacking Italy, 82
See also House of Commons
Greiser, Dr., 28-29

Haig, General, 3
Henderson, Arthur, 60, 61
defines task of Disarmament Conference, 52-53
Herriot, Edouard, 39
Hitler, 81, 98, 100, 147
concept of State of, 131
demands increase in birth rate, 120
disregards Locarno Treaty, 41
Nuremberg Conference, 111-112
Hoare, Sir Samuel, 96, 97
Hoare-Laval proposal, 100-101
Holy Alliance, 23
Holt, Hamilton, 15
Hoover, Herbert, 46, 58
House of Commons, rejects "Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance," 38
rejects Geneva Protocol, 40
Hughes, Charles Evans, 44
Hull, Cordell, 137, 144-145
Huxley, Aldous, 124-125

Idealism, 3
Idealists, 20, 21
contrasted with "realists," 15-16
reply of, to "realists," 62-63
Imports, 109-110
Inskip, Sir Thomas, 29, 30
International relations, chaos in, 18-19
Italy, 13, 29, 34, 67, 68
birth rate, 115-116
disregards sanctions, 91 ff.
Ethiopia as an outlet for population of, 115
Fascist youth, 147
need of raw materials, 107, 109, 110
population of Italian colonies, 117
success of colonies, 112

Japan, 12, 29, 34, 67, 68, 108, 184
breaks up Naval Conference of 1933, 47
denounces treaties, 46
disregards sanctions, 92
injects new problem into Disarmament Conference, 51

Lake Tana, 99
Lanier, Sidney, 165
Laval, Pierre, 100
Hoare-Laval proposal, 101
Laws, enforceable under certain conditions, 102-103
League Covenant, 39
League of Churches, 9
League of Nations, 8, 9, 13, 19, 29, 41
achievements of, 74-77
application of sanctions against Japan and Italy, 91 ff.
as a League of Governments, 69
Covenant of, 67
created out of hate, 66
delay in actions against Italy, 103
dissension over sanctions, 82
divergence of opinion within, 99
effect of refusal of the United States to join, 43-44

League of Nations—(*Cont.*)
fails to help Emperor of Ethiopia, 28
formal professionalism, 70-71
founded to promote disarmament, 33-34
initial weakness due to United States, 65
international police force, 103-105
mandates, 70
momentarily powerless, 65
proper course against Italy, 94
reasons for failure of, 36
refusal to include certain nations, 70
resignation of Germany, 60
sanctions, 88 ff.
suggested basis for membership, 82-83
"Temporary Mixed Commission," 37
vindicated by public opinion, 101
withdrawal of United States, 69-70
Lecky, 160
Libya, 93
Lindbergh, Charles, 2
Litvinoff, Maxim, urges complete disarmament, 55-56
Locarno Treaty, 40-41, 98, 182
London Naval Conference, 46

MacDonald, Ramsay, 39, 62
Markets, adjustment of, 121-124
Marx, Karl, theory of ultimate revolution, 161-162
Matteotti, 132
Merrill, William P., 15, 169
Morand, Paul, 93, 99
Munitions makers, 36, 50-51, 184
Mussolini, 13, 25, 65, 81, 100, 114, 132
concept of State of, 131

Napoleon, 1
Nationalism, 26, 126 ff., 185-186
Nazi Youth Movement, 146-147
New Commonwealth Society, 104
Nile River, 99
Nine Power Treaty, 45
Nuremberg Conference, 1936, 111

Oil, 93, 185
O'Ryan, Major General John F., 4

Pact of Paris, (see Briand-Kellogg Pact)
Pan-American Conference, 9
Paraguay, 183
Patriotism, 142
See also Nationalism
Paul, 85-86
Peace, activities among churches in education for, 155-156
as a product of community effort, 78-80
basis of new program for, 31
can be attained through world organization, 64
church program for education toward, 174-180
education for, 143 ff.
enforcement of, 89-90
forces for, today, 5-7, 188-189
French thesis, 97-98
inadequacy of present safeguards, 91-92
issues depend on individuals, 7
loss of sovereignty as a price of, 185
nationalism as an enemy of, 185, 186

Peace—(*Continued*)
need of new program for, 31
prerequisites of world, 97
preserved by international police force, 103-105
price of, 181 ff.
reasons for failure of efforts toward, 2
responsibility of churches for, 3
seemingly unenforceable, 101
Pershing, General John J., 1
Poland, 112
Politis, 40, 60, 61
Population, of hungry nations, 110-111
Preparedness, 13
Program of Training in World Friendship, 149

Raw materials, 107 ff.
relationship to war, 117
Realism, 21
at Disarmament Conference, 61
results of so-called, 31
spurious, 11-15
Rearmament, cost of today, 29-30
reason for today, 25-26
results of, 27
Red Network, 8
Religion, 158 ff.
pessimism of modern philosophy of, 161-168
Resolution No. 14, 38
Rhineland, 98
Rome, 23, 24
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 9
Rosenberg, Arthur, 120
R.O.T.C., 25, 151, 157
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 126-127
Russia, 42, 70
prohibition of religious teaching, 146

Sanctions, defined, 88-89
economic, against Italy, 92-94
ineffectiveness of moral indignation, 101
involve ultimate use of force, 91
peaceful, 90
war threatened by use of, 95
Schirach, Baldur Von, 146
Seldes, Gilbert, 131
Shearer, William B., 46
Shotwell, James T., 32-33, 56
Simon, Sir John, 57
Spain, 173
Stalin, 132-133
State, 126-132, 139-142
as a social organism, 127
autocracy, 128
Hitler's concept of, 131
loyalties, 141-142
Mussolini's concept of, 131
realistic attitude toward, 140
relationship of Church to, 129-130
theory of Rousseau, 126-127
Stimson, Henry, 58, 59, 184, 185
Student World, The, 168-169
Suez Canal, 93

Tardieu, André, 98
Tariffs, 136-138
"Temporary Mixed Commission," 37
Treaties, sanctity of, 13
Treaty for Mutual Assistance, 40

United States, 34, 69
educational activity in behalf of peace, in, 148-151
effects of refusal to join League, 36, 43-44
preparations for war, 30

United States—(*Continued*)
"Red rider," 153-154
responsible for initial weakness of League, 65
responsibility for world's disorder, 134-138
tariffs, 116-117, 136-138

Versailles, Treaty of, 33, 98
Vienna, Conference of, 1

Walsh, Dr. James, 15
War, a racket, 36
as the cord running through history, 22-23
hatefulness of, 25
international police force to prevent, 103-105
must be stopped before it begins, 96 ff.
War—(*Continued*)
relationship to raw materials, 117
War debts, 27-28, 135-136
Washington, Booker T., 140
Washington Naval Conference, 44-45
Wilson, Woodrow, 66-67, 69, 95
World Alliance, Chamby, 1936, 123
World Community, 64
considerations in building, 87-88
depends on cooperation of great powers, 99
growth of, 79-80
ideal of, 87
need of a force commanding respect, 101
new idealism needed, 106
World Court, 13

Date Due			
[redacted]			
F 16 '39			
30 '42			
Ap 1 '43			
MR 27 '44			
JY 7- '50			
JY 21 '50			
DEC 1 3 '66			
JAN 3 1 1990			

499
492

JX1952 .A87
Prelude to peace; a realistic view of
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00025 9285